

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition urging Smith-Bankhead bill (S. 4922 and H. R. 12880), rehabilitating through vocational training workmen disabled by industrial accidents; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition signed by citizens of Alameda County, Cal., that all privileges given osteopaths in House bill 5118 be extended to chiropractors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. O. E. Carlstrom, Aledo, Ill., and divers other citizens of Mercer County, Ill., who are relatives or friends of men in the military service, for favorable consideration of House bill 5407 and Senate bill 4919, in order that the services of osteopathic physicians may be available to them while in the service of their country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HADLEY: Memorial to Congress from Port Commission of the Port of Seattle, relative to accidents on the Alaskan coast; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of Dr. Hester L. Abbott and other friends and relatives of men in the service of the United States, requesting of the Congress favorable action respecting Senate bill 4914 and House bill 5407, in order that the services of osteopathic physicians may be available to such men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 5, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that by Thy grace and leadership we have come out of a great struggle with clean hands and pure hearts. And now as we gather the fruits of a great victory and seek to adjust the relationships of men, we pray that we may be guided by the Divine Spirit, that as in all our history of the past so to-day we may build upon the sure foundations of the gospel of Thy Son the Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. We pray to this end that Thou wilt guide us in our deliberations. Give us that unity of counsel which can only come out of the common origin and source of truth, Thy Word. May success attend our efforts to bring universal peace and brotherhood to the earth. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

THOMAS W. HARDWICK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FOREIGN POLICY OF SPAIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, which will be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The communication is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 3, 1918.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
Vice President of the United States,
United States Senate.

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that a note has been received from the ambassador of Spain at this Capital, in which he states that when the new Spanish Government, presided over by Marquis de Alhucemas, presented itself before the Congress of Deputies the president of the council of ministers declared that the foreign policy of the Government over which it presided was steered in intimate understanding with the western powers of Europe and the United States. The ambassador also states that two incidental motions, differently worded but to the same effect, were introduced offering congratulations on the termination of hostilities and on the dawning of justice over force, the basis of liberty and fraternity among the peoples. The second of these two motions was passed with only two dissenting votes. In conclusion, the ambassador states that his Government desires the particularly unanimous sentiment of the Spanish Congress, which has given by its vote evidence of the earnest sympathy it cherishes toward the allied people and Governments, made known to the Congress of the United States.

A similar letter has been addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,
ROBERT LANSING.

SENATOR FROM LOUISIANA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificate of the governor of Louisiana certifying to the election of Hon. JOSEPH EUGENE RANDELL as a Senator from the State of Louisiana, which will be read and placed on the file.

The credentials are as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, JOSEPH EUGENE RANDELL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Witness, his excellency our governor, Ruffin G. Pleasant, and our seal hereto affixed at Baton Rouge, this 26th day of November in the year of our Lord 1918.

By the governor:

RUFFIN G. PLEASANT,
Governor.
JAMES J. BURLEY,
Secretary of State.

[SEAL.]

STATEMENT BY EX-PRESIDENT TAFT.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the statement by former President William Howard Taft, published in the Washington Post of December 5, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAFT DEFENDS WILSON'S TRIP; SAYS ADVANTAGES ARE CLEAR; CONSTITUTION CONFERS THE RIGHT—BELIEVES PRESIDENT'S PRESENCE AT PEACE CONFERENCE WILL GIVE IT A DEMOCRATIC STAMP—PROPER FOR HIM TO ASPIRE TO BE HEAD OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS—IGNORING OF SENATE DOES NOT JUSTIFY RETALIATORY ACTION, FORMER PRESIDENT THINKS.

(By William Howard Taft.)

"If one can judge from the serious doubts of the wisdom of the President's going in person to the Paris conference expressed in friendly Democratic newspapers, it is not popular. What the political effect of his trip will be it is idle to discuss so far in advance of the next presidential election. Much is to happen in the domestic field in the next two years.

"The advantages of the President's going seem clear. His presence in the conference will stamp upon it a democratic character in the eyes of all but the wild bolsheviks. This will be a real aid in allaying the unrest among the peoples of the allies. The conference between Mr. Wilson, Lloyd George, M. Clemenceau, and Sr. Orlando must be useful to the world. What is of the utmost importance is that the four great allies shall work in harmony in the great task before them. In these four men we shall have the men of real power in the four great nations.

HIS POWER LIKE PREMIER.

"King George, President Poincare, and King Victor Emmanuel are not the actual wielders of power in their respective countries as Mr. Wilson is in this. His powers are more analogous to those of the three premiers, except that he adds to his the titular headship of the American Nation as well. The personal contact of the real leaders, the intimacies of their informal conversations, and the human touch of it all should rub off angles and corners and make for sympathetic aims and harmony. Those who have projected plans for the league of nations have always insisted that the members of its executive councils should be the premiers and actual executives, in order that the council should be truly representative and have power to act.

PROPER HEAD FOR NATION'S LEAGUE.

"It has been said that Mr. Wilson aspires to be president of the league of nations. If so, it is a proper aspiration. No one could fill that place better than the President of the United States, if such a league is formed. It should attach to the office and not to the person, of course, so that when Mr. Wilson retires he should give way to his successor. The disinterestedness of this country in respect to most questions arising from the decision and action of the league would make the American President a most fitting head.

"Again, it will help President Wilson to go to the conference. He will learn much of the European situation at first hand. He will have an unusual opportunity to study the possibilities of a league of nations, its practical difficulties and their solution. There is nothing like oral intimate discussion to winnow out real differences and to remove disagreements due to misunderstanding. Of course these views are predicated on all these national leaders having open minds, a willingness to consult, and a desire to agree. If any one of them holds himself aloof from the discussion and deliberation with fixed views on every topic, he would as well stay at home.

NO CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION.

"There is no constitutional inhibition, express or implied, to prevent the President's going abroad to discharge a function

clearly given him by the Constitution. That instrument says that he shall make treaties by and with the consent of two-thirds of the Senate. It is a curious error to assume that the President himself may not attend a conference to which he can send a delegate.

"King George would hardly sit in the conference, because he has not the real power to make treaties or to appoint a delegate. Those powers are exercised by the premier, Mr. Lloyd George, who will be in person a member of the conference. It therefore comes down to the question whether the President may not in person perform a duty imposed upon him by law when it is to be performed out of the country. There is certainly no express restriction of this sort in the Constitution, and it is difficult to see why it should be implied.

"The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. If we had a military genius in the Presidency like Foch or Napoleon is it possible that the country could not avail itself of his services in a critical campaign, even though that took him out of the United States when Congress is not in session?

CAN PERFORM DUTIES IN PARIS.

"The President can by cable perform all his executive duties from Paris. If his duty abroad is more important than his duty here in connection with a session of Congress, Congress may well wait until his return, or, if the public exigency requires, may invite the Vice President to do these things as Acting President which the absence of the President on foreign duty prevents his doing.

"Our Constitution is great in its elastic character and in its adapting itself to the changing and varying needs of the unseen future. No other executive is forbidden to leave the country. Kings do it, premiers do it, why should we infer such a restriction when it is not expressed? Its expediency, of course, is a question for the President. Were he to abuse his discretion and leave the country the people would condemn it at the polls or it might even become a subject for impeachment. But when the duty which he is to perform is of such an importance as the present one his decision to perform it in person the Houses of Congress may well respect.

SENATE RESENTS BEING IGNORED.

"The President's persistence in ignoring the Senate by appointing no Senator to the commission and in ignoring Congress by giving no real exposition of his present view of the peace terms created a resentful feeling, which was unfortunately manifested in the reception of his message on Monday last. The disposition of some to nag the President, however, by urging the adoption of resolutions inviting the Vice President to act for the President meets with no popular favor.

"If the fact or the manner of the President's going is a mistake, and it is unpopular with the American people, that may be made a legitimate ground for criticism in a political campaign. But those who would now seek to create an embarrassment out of the present situation will not commend themselves as engaged in a patriotic purpose. If it be true that the President has acted without due consideration to the Senate or to Congress, the people will not justify the Senate or Congress in a retaliatory action. For the Republicans it is the poorest kind of politics. The President goes to represent the United States, and the setting up of a backfire here will not help the country or its success in the conference, and from a political standpoint it will react upon those who set it. Mr. MANN's position in this respect is a wise one and all Republicans should approve it."

REPORT OF SERGEANT AT ARMS (S. DOC. NO. 312).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the sale of property and the proceeds thereof which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

LIBERTY BOND ACTS (H. DOC. NO. 1474).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, statements of expenditures under the various liberty-bond acts, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 1396).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting,

pursuant to law, a report showing the number of persons, the grades and character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided by the act of June 12, 1917, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COURT OF CUSTOMS APPEALS (H. DOC. NO. 1366).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the expenditures of the appropriations for the United States Court of Customs Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL WAR DEPARTMENT FORCE (H. DOC. NO. 1496).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing by bureaus and offices the number and designation of the persons employed under the appropriations for the temporary employment of the additional force in the War Department and the annual rate of compensation paid to each, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

VALUATION OF CARRIERS (H. DOC. NO. 1388).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the employment under appropriation for the valuation of carriers for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CENSORSHIP EMPLOYEES (H. DOC. NO. 1473).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of censorship employees and the compensation allowed each, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

LIST OF JUDGMENTS (H. DOC. NO. 1491).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by the court for the year ended November 30, 1918, etc., which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

SUPPORT OF INDIAN SCHOOLS (H. DOC. NO. 1502).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the fiscal year 1918 relating to the appropriation "Indian schools, support, 1918," which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SIOUX INDIAN FUND (H. DOC. NO. 1505).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of expenditures from the permanent fund of the Sioux Indians during the fiscal year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

TONGUE RIVER RESERVATION, MONT. (H. DOC. NO. 1507).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of expenditures made for the purpose of encouraging industry and support among the Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont., during the fiscal year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

DISEASE AMONG INDIANS (H. DOC. NO. 1524).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, stating, pursuant to law, that no expenditures were made during the fiscal year 1918 for the construction of hospitals from the appropriation "Relieving distress and prevention, etc., of disease among Indians, 1918," which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 1501).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, stating, pursuant to law, that no diversion of expenditures were made during the fiscal year 1918 under the act approved March 1, 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

HEIRS OF DECEASED INDIANS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all moneys collected and deposited during the fiscal year 1918 under the appropriation "Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees, 1918," which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN HOSTILITIES (H. DOC. NO. 1522).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, stating, pursuant to law, that no act of hostility by any Indian tribe with which the United States has treaty stipulations has been committed during the fiscal year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

INDUSTRIES AMONG THE INDIANS (H. DOC. NO. 1510).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the expenditures made for the purpose of encouraging industry among the Indians of the various reservations during the fiscal year 1918, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

CHIPPewa INDIAN FUNDS (H. DOC. NO. 1493).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures from the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN SCHOOLS (H. DOC. NO. 1492).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the amounts expended at each Indian school and agency from the appropriation for construction, lease, purchase, and repair and improvement of school and agency buildings, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS (H. DOC. NO. 1494).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the cost and other data with respect to Indian irrigation projects as compiled to the end of the fiscal year 1918, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

CARE OF TIMBER (H. DOC. NO. 1501).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures on account of the Indian Service for the fiscal year 1918 from the appropriation commonly known as "Industrial work and care of timber," which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN MONEYS (H. DOC. NO. 1509).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the expenditures for the fiscal year 1918 of moneys carried on the books of the department under the caption "Indian moneys and proceeds of labor," which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SURVEYS OF INDIAN LANDS (H. DOC. NO. 1508).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the cost of all survey and allotment work on Indian reservations for the fiscal year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYEES IN THE INDIAN SERVICE (H. DOC. NO. 1506).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the diversion of appropriations for the pay of specified employees in the Indian Service during the fiscal year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

CONFEDERATED BANDS OF UTE INDIANS (H. DOC. NO. 1487).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the expenditures made from the tribal funds

of the Confederated Bands of Utes during the fiscal year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

APACHE, KIOWA, AND COMANCHE INDIANS (H. DOC. NO. 1486).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the expenditures made in per capita payments to the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians during the fiscal year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

NORTHERN CHEYENNE INDIANS (H. DOC. NO. 1504).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of expenditures made for the purchase of cattle for the Northern Cheyenne Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, Mont., which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPAIRS OF BUILDINGS, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (H. DOC. NO. 1541).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized statement of expenditures made by the Interior Department and charged to the appropriation "Repairs of buildings, Department of the Interior, 1918," which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (H. DOC. NO. 1543).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized statement of expenditures made by the Interior Department and charged to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1918," which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL (H. DOC. NO. 1515).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a letter from the superintendent of the St. Elizabeths Hospital submitting the financial report of that institution for the fiscal year 1918, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SALE OF OBSOLETE MATERIAL (H. DOC. NO. 1519).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the proceeds of the sale of supplies and obsolete material and equipment during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

BLACKFEET INDIAN FUNDS (H. DOC. NO. 1488).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures from the tribal funds of the Blackfeet Indians of Montana, for the fiscal year 1918, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

STANDING ROCK INDIAN RESERVATION (H. DOC. NO. 1489).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of expenditures made for the purchase of cattle for the benefit of the Indians on the Standing Rock Reservation, in North Dakota and South Dakota, for the fiscal year 1918, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES (H. DOC. NO. 1523).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the disbursements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, under the act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and mechanic arts, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

FREEDMAN'S HOSPITAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the surgeon in chief of the Freedman's Hospital, submitting a detailed statement of expenditures for professional and other services for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc.

No. 1518), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a letter from the surgeon in chief of the Freedman's Hospital submitting statements of receipts and expenditures on account of pay patients during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1516), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

PURCHASE OF TYPEWRITERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of typewriters and other labor-saving devices purchased and exchanged during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1525), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, statement of typewriters and other labor-saving devices purchased and exchanged during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1372), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of typewriters and other labor-saving devices purchased and exchanged during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1382), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the number of typewriters and other labor-saving devices purchased and exchanged during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1383), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Superintendent of Library Building and Grounds, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the number of typewriters and other labor-saving devices purchased and exchanged during the fiscal year 1918, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TRAVEL OF EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail what officers or employees have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1397), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a statement from the Librarian of Congress showing in detail what officers or employees have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1527), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail what officers or employees have traveled on official business to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1531), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Superintendent of the United States Botanic Gardens, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail what officers or employees have traveled on official business to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 5511), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Superintendent of Library Buildings and Grounds, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail the travel of employees from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1499), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COMPENSATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the average number of employees receiving increased compensation under the act approved July 3, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1377), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the average number of employees receiving increased compensation under the act approved July 3, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1540), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Superintendent of the United States Botanic Gardens, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the average number of employees receiving increased compensation under the act approved July 3, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1483), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the average number of employees receiving increased compensation during the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1479), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Superintendent of Library Building and Grounds, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the average number of employees receiving increased compensation during the fiscal year 1918, (H. Doc. No. 1468), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (H. DOC. NO. 1431).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE (H. DOC. NO. 1480).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a special report dealing with the subject of resale price maintenance, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON LIBRARY BUILDING AND GROUNDS (H. DOC. NO. 1434).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Superintendent of Library Building and Grounds for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, which was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 356) authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1918, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 13153) extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at the foot of Garrison Avenue, at Fort Smith, Ark., and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I present resolutions of Local Union, No. 38-A-2, Shipyard Laborers, Riggers, and Fasteners, of Seattle, Wash., representing about 4,000 members, urging the establishment of another national holiday to be known as "Liberty Day," and to be the 11th of November. I move that it be referred to the proper committee. I will say to the Chair that I do not know to what committee it ought to go.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Several similar resolutions have gone to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That reference is satisfactory. I move that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the National Academy of Sciences, praying for the establishment of a league of nations for the maintenance of peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the Strong-Scott Manufacturing Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the proposed tax of 80 per cent of the earnings in excess of 10 per cent of the invested capital in the pending revenue bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial from the Minneapolis Automobile Trade Association of Minnesota, remonstrating against the increased rate of taxation on automobiles in the pending revenue bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Marshall-Wells Co., of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against the 10 per cent tax on

ammunition and sporting goods in the pending revenue bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

MANUFACTURE OF MUNITIONS AND CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce to move that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 181) to authorize and empower the War Industries Board to aid in equipping and expanding power plants to carry on the manufacture of munitions and construction of ships during the war, advance moneys for that purpose to owners and operators of private plants, etc., be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND PEACE CONFERENCE.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back Senate resolution 358 to create a committee of eight Senators, which shall be charged with the duty of proceeding to Paris at the proper time to be present during the peace conference, and I submit a report (No. 616) to accompany the resolution, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Relations having considered Senate resolution 358, to create a committee of eight Senators which shall be charged with the duty of proceeding to Paris at the proper time in order to be present during the peace conference, unanimously report it back to the Senate adversely, with the recommendation that it be not passed.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted the following additional views:

I make this separate report by reason of the fact that I offered an amendment to the resolution on the floor of the Senate, proposing that the number of the committee be increased from 8 to 96, which would include the entire membership of the Senate. That my position may not be misunderstood, I desire that it be known that I at all times opposed the sending of any committee of Senators to Paris, and so voted as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, for the following reasons:

Section 2 of Article II of the Constitution of the United States empowers the President of the United States, and the President solely, "to make treaties." The Senate may advise with regard to a treaty, but it may not participate in nor interfere with the President in the initiation and negotiation of a treaty. It is true that the treaty does not become operative until concurred in by two-thirds of the Senate. This, however, is an act to be performed subsequent to the making of the treaty. The President has undertaken in person to perform this great constitutional duty. He has called to his assistance an efficient corps of statesmen, experts, and statisticians.

The proposed committee could perform no constitutional function imposed upon the Senate with relation to treaties. It would have no legal status in connection with the negotiation or making of the treaty. Its methods of obtaining information would, in the nature of the circumstances, be vagrant, uncertain, and unreliable. The report of such a committee to the Senate would be based chiefly upon hearsay and would constitute but the individual conclusions of the members of the committee and would have little force and effect with the Senate.

Such committee would neither have the information nor the power to advise on behalf of the Senate. This fact, unfortunately, might not be known to all of the foreign members of the peace council and expressions made by the members of such committee might be taken as an expression of the sentiment or a pronouncement of the position of the United States Senate with regard to questions under consideration before the peace council and in such way might embarrass and interfere with the President in the performance of his constitutional duties in the making of the treaty.

All facts bearing upon the negotiations must be presented to the peace council, and the President will undoubtedly report such facts fully to the Senate of the United States and to the country. He has already made this promise to Congress.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask that the resolution go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. PITTMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file a separate report in connection with Senate resolution 358, and I ask to have it printed in the RECORD, together with the report of the committee, submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 5091) granting a pension to Jennie L. Barrows (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK:

A bill (S. 5092) to repeal the act approved June 15, 1917; and a bill (S. 5093) to repeal the act approved May 16, 1918; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 5094) to repeal the act approved August 10, 1917; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 5095) to repeal the act approved May 22, 1918; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 5096) to repeal the act approved July 16, 1918; and

A bill (S. 5097) to amend section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners,

and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, by providing that such control shall continue for a period not greater than six months from the passage of this act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 5098) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes"; and

A bill (S. 5099) providing for road construction and improvement out of the funds derived from the operation of motor trucks engaged in carrying parcel post under section 7 of the act making appropriations for the Post Office Department and the Postal Service for the fiscal year 1919, approved July 8, 1918; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 5100) for the relief of Anna M. Tobin, independent executrix of the estate of Frank R. Tobin, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 5102) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Charlotte Graveret* to *T. K. Maher*; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5103) granting a pension to Mary M. Hood;

A bill (S. 5104) granting a pension to Adolph L. Weaver;

A bill (S. 5105) granting a pension to Sylva Tarvin; and

A bill (S. 5106) granting an increase of pension to Amos L. Hood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 5107) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Hering; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 5108) to amend section 126 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 5109) to provide relief where formal contracts have not been made in the manner required by law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 5110) granting a pension to Lily D. Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BECKHAM:

A bill (S. 5111) granting an increase of pension to Albert L. Newlands; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW (by request):

A bill (S. 5112) to provide for paying claims to depositors of the Freedman's Savings & Trust Co., and for the establishment of a national home; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KING:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 192) to stop work upon Government housing propositions; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I introduce the bill which I send to the desk and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and in connection with it I ask that an explanation of its purport be printed to follow the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 5101) for the relief of certain noncommissioned officers of the United States Army who were recalled to active service during the recent war and commissioned as officers was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and, with the accompanying statement, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill (S. 5101) for the relief of certain noncommissioned officers of the United States Army who were recalled to active service during the recent war and commissioned as officers.

Be it enacted, etc., That retired enlisted men of the Regular Army who were called to active service by orders of the War Department during the war with Germany and commissioned in the armies of the United States, and who will again revert to a retired status when their services are no longer required, be allowed to retain the rank held by them when mustered out of or discharged from active service and given the pay of a first lieutenant on the retired list, provided that muster out or discharge was not due to incompetency or misconduct.

MEMORANDUM.

There have been called into active service and commissioned during the present war some one hundred and fifty enlisted men from the retired list. Practically all of these men were of the highest noncommissioned grade at date of retirement, having held those grades for a long time, in many cases from 20 to 25 years.

It will be observed that the men who attained the highest noncommissioned grades and thus retired were men who on account of the strenuous life of the period in which they served must necessarily have possessed physical, mental, and moral qualifications of the highest degree, having been so retired when the country deemed it necessary that these particularly qualified experts should be brought in for the service of the country they were looked over and selected, not by

guesswork, but by their records, their qualifications, their reliability and efficiency, and on these accounts only were they sought for by the country and offered commissions. The fact was they were the only people that could "deliver the goods" along this line, the only people capable of performing these duties, in fact, the only living experts in existence.

The mere fact that patriotic, intelligent, expert officers of the United States Army turned their attention at once to this particular class of men, and having weighed them and judged them by records, qualifications, and past records, and on these offered them commissions as captains, majors and higher ranks, is sufficient guaranty of their high standard, rendering them deserving of consideration.

Their records during this war have justified the fact that their selection did not come by political or other outward influence; when they accepted the commissions they performed the duties assigned them as they did in the old Army, in all good faith, without asking for choice of stations or for any other consideration, simply giving up civic duties and abandoning business pursuits which they had established after retirement and which netted them a comfortable living, and which can not be rebuilt after the war is over; on this account they are entitled to any consideration you can give them.

Retired Army officers up to the grade of colonel recalled to active service have already been provided for, inasmuch as they will attain a higher grade upon again reverting to a retired status.

If this allowance is granted it affects but a small number of men, and as these men die the list will be lessened and in time entirely eliminated.

In justice to these men it is therefore proposed that a bill be introduced in Congress providing:

That retired enlisted men who have been returned to active service and commissioned in the armies of the United States during the present war and who again revert to a retired status be given the rank they then held, with the pay of a first lieutenant, provided they have not been returned to a retired status due to their own incompetency or misconduct.

THE PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE—PAPER BY HENRY E. DAVIS (S. DOC. 308).

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I offer the following Senate resolution and ask unanimous consent to have it considered at this time. It proposes to print as a Senate document a monograph by a distinguished member of the District bar, Mr. Henry E. Davis. It was written some thirty years ago, at the time of the wounding of President Garfield. It is entitled "Inability of the President—What Constitutes and Who Decides?" It will save the Senate, I think, and those who are interested in the question a large amount of investigation if this monograph can be printed as a Senate document.

The resolution (S. Res. 366) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Senate resolution 366.

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Inability of the President—What Constitutes and Who Decides?" a monograph by Henry E. Davis, be printed as a Senate document.

MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. BORAH. I offer a resolution, which I ask may be read and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 370) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Senate resolution 370.

Whereas in September, 1796, George Washington, then President of the United States, declared, "The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible * * *." And that "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities"; and

Whereas in response to a letter addressed to him by James Monroe, then President of the United States, concerning the policy afterwards declared by President Monroe and since then known as the Monroe doctrine, Thomas Jefferson said in reply: "The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a Nation. This sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us. And never could we embark upon it under the circumstances more auspicious. Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs. America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe and particularly her own. She should therefore have a system of her own separate and apart from that of Europe"; and

Whereas James Monroe, President of the United States, afterwards amplified this policy, incorporating it in a message to the Congress of the United States, declaring in effect that any attempt on the part of foreign Governments to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety, and setting forth in full the policy which was afterwards and ever since has been known as the Monroe doctrine; and

Whereas the policies thus early announced by Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe, and ever since adhered to by this country, regardless of political parties, have contributed greatly to the peace and happiness of the people of the United States; and

Whereas we believe any material departure from these policies would be fraught with danger to the peace and happiness of the people of the United States, involving us, in all probability, in the controversies of other nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States reaffirm its faith and confidence in the permanent worth and wisdom of these policies and shall seek in all matters coming before it touching the interests or affairs of foreign countries to conform its acts to these time-honored principles so long and so happily a part of our own policy.

ABROGATION OF TREATIES.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 367), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the following information:

1. What countries, if any, have notified the United States of their intention to abrogate any treaties with the United States; and what treaties are to be abrogated and the reason therefor, if any are given.

2. The countries with which the United States has treaties which prevent us from giving preferences to Americans or American ships in the carrying of imports or exports, and what is necessary to be done to abrogate such treaties, and what, if any, steps our Government has taken to secure the abrogation of the same.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 368), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the United States Shipping Board be, and it is hereby, directed to report to the Senate as soon as practicable what legislation, in its judgment, should be enacted by Congress to promote, continue, and insure the maintenance, development, and operation of a merchant marine under the American flag.

INVESTIGATION OF SPRUCE PRODUCTION.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 369), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby requested to inform the Senate what steps, if any, have been taken upon the recommendation of Hon. Charles E. Hughes for an investigation of the spruce production section of the Aeroplane Division of the Signal Corps of the United States Army.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. REED submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 371), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Fund of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds or any subcommittee thereof be directed to inquire into the costs, construction, operation, maintenance, and future disposition of the public buildings of the Government of every nature, kind, and location, and the program and contracts of the various departments of the Government with reference to future costs, construction, operation, maintenance, and disposition of the Government buildings of every nature, kind, and location, and report to the Senate thereon, together with their recommendation of any steps which they may deem advisable to take with a view to remedying conditions.

That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fifth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

HOUSING OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 372), which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

Resolved, That every official and agency of the Government, having had in charge any work, operations, construction, or expenditures authorized by the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to provide housing for war needs," approved May 16, 1918, shall and is hereby required to make a full report and account of the same to the Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to make an investigation of all work, operations, and construction, and of all expenditures made under said act, and report its findings to the Senate.

UNIFORMS OF DISCHARGED SOLDIERS.

Mr. POMERENE. I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask that it may be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 191) providing that soldiers, sailors, and marines may retain uniforms and apparel worn by them in the military service of the United States as their personal property and permitting them to wear the same under regulations to be prescribed by the War Department, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That soldiers, sailors, and marines, whether in the service at home or abroad, be and they are hereby permitted to retain as their own property the uniforms, including overcoats and other articles of wearing apparel furnished them by the Government and severally worn by them at the time of their demobilization and discharge, and that they shall be permitted to wear the same under such reasonable regulations to be prescribed by the War Department as will distinguish the said soldiers, sailors, and marines so demobilized and discharged from the service and wearing the same from those who may be continued in the actual military, naval, or marine service of the country.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senate, I should like, in a word, to give a brief explanation of the joint resolution.

The War Department gave out a statement sometime ago, as I learned through the press, to the effect that the soldiers after their demobilization and discharge would be permitted to wear

their uniforms for a period of 30 days. Since I prepared the joint resolution I have been advised that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] introduced the other day a similar resolution.

I think this is a matter of the very greatest importance to the soldiers, marines, and sailors themselves, because of the very high price of wearing apparel now. Many of these boys, I am told, not knowing how long they would be away from their homes, gave away or otherwise disposed of their clothing, and they would be put to very large expense to get new clothes if they were not permitted to wear their uniforms more than 30 days after demobilization. Certainly these uniforms and wearing apparel are of very much more value to them as individuals than they would be to the Government.

In addition to that, we are all admonished that there is a scarcity of wools and woolen, and I think common business prudence would suggest that the soldiers, sailors, and marines be permitted to wear their uniforms after they have severed their connection with the service.

I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. I have only heard the joint resolution as it was hastily read. Does it provide for any additional pay, or simply permit the soldiers to wear their uniforms?

Mr. POMERENE. It applies only to their uniforms and their clothing.

Mr. BORAH. Is the joint resolution which the Senator from Ohio introduced to go to a committee?

Mr. POMERENE. I asked that it go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BORAH. I only want to say, Mr. President, that I hope the joint resolution will be reported out in a reasonable time and favorably. It occurred to me that it is of such merit it could be disposed of without going to a committee.

Mr. POMERENE. I have no objection to the disposition of it now. I may say, I think with propriety, I spoke to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs yesterday, and I know he favors the general principle. I have not submitted to him the joint resolution as it has been drawn.

Mr. JONES of Washington and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator from Washington, who first rose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am heartily in favor of the joint resolution the Senator from Ohio has introduced, but I think it would also be well to add to it a provision that when the soldiers are discharged they shall be entitled to the same transportation pay to their homes that members of the Navy are entitled to receive. I noticed in the papers sometime ago that these men were not getting sufficient to cover their transportation expenses home. That ought to be provided for.

I remember when the reorganization bill was up I endeavored to get a provision in that bill that would put the soldiers of the Army on exactly the same basis as members of the Navy upon their discharge. Apparently we could not get that done. We did get some additional compensation provided. Something of that sort ought to be done, and it would be well to put in such a provision in connection with the measure of the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. I have rather assumed that something of that kind would be done; at least, I hope it shall be done, but my attention has been specially called to the question of the uniforms and clothing, and with that thought in mind I prepared the joint resolution.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know that, but I think the two can very well be covered together.

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was going to say that I think an arrangement has been made to carry out the suggestion of the Senator from Washington, and the matter raised by the Senator from Ohio has also been under consideration. I think it would be well to have the joint resolution go to the committee, as there are some technical questions involved, and a general policy may be outlined in the committee so that there can be no confusion. The committee meets to-morrow, and there will be no delay.

Mr. POMERENE. I may state that in the latter part of the joint resolution I have provided that the uniforms should be worn under some rule or regulation to be adopted by the War Department, so as to distinguish, perhaps, those who had been in the service but were discharged, from those who were actually in the service. I can understand how it might be possible to

abuse the privilege of wearing the uniforms under certain circumstances. I think the Committee on Military Affairs would work that out so as to guard every interest.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the difficulty has already arisen. Some men are wearing uniforms and refusing to salute officers. It is a matter which ought to be considered by the committee so as to avoid any difficulty of that sort.

Mr. POMERENE. I have no doubt the committee will arrange proper safeguards.

Mr. JONES of Washington and Mr. CUMMINS addressed the Chair.

Mr. POMERENE. I yield first to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Florida, that the matter of travel pay had been arranged for, I do not see how it can be done within the law unless we pass some legislation, because the reorganization act fixed the specific amount which should be paid for this purpose. I hope it has been possible to arrange it, but I think it will require legislation. I understand a bill has already been introduced covering the matter. I am glad that is true, and I hope if the joint resolution of the Senator from Ohio is to be acted upon such a provision may be put in it so as to get them through together.

Mr. POMERENE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. For the information of the Senator from Ohio I wish to say that two or three weeks ago I introduced a bill to give soldiers and sailors the uniforms they are wearing at the time of their discharge. It was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and I have the promise of the chairman of that committee and several members of the committee that the subject will be taken up on Friday morning at the regular meeting of the committee for the purpose of considering the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. I was not aware that the Senator from Iowa had introduced the bill. I wish to say that I have no pride of authorship, and I shall be glad to have any disposition of the subject which will meet the situation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there are two or three matters affecting the allowances made to discharged soldiers which it seems to me might be taken up by the Committee on Military Affairs together, and in the consideration of the bill the Senator from Iowa has introduced there would be no objection to attaching as a part of that measure the matter of travel pay and the matter which has been recommended by the War Department, allowing one month's extra pay to discharged soldiers. Most of the soldiers are discharged without any money at all, and they are allowed 3½ cents a mile travel pay. That is not sufficient to pay for their expenses, for their meals en route and their railroad fare, to say nothing of sleeping apartments on the train. It seems to me there ought to be some provision made so that the reasonable actual expenses of these men should be allowed.

There is another matter that I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will consider in the same connection. Under the present law the men are allowed travel pay to the place of their enlistment. They ought to be allowed travel pay to their homes. There are many cases where men enlisted at some place very far removed from their homes. I have had my attention called to cases where men whose homes were on the Pacific coast enlisted in Chicago because they happened to be in Chicago at the time they were called for enlistment, and as a matter of saving time and of convenience they enlisted at that point. When they are discharged from the Army they want to return to their permanent homes. It seems to me, therefore, nothing but fair that they should be allowed travel pay to their actual bona fide permanent place of residence to which they want to return.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JONES of Washington subsequently said:

I introduce a bill for reference to the Military Affairs Committee. I will simply say that it relates to the matters I referred to this morning in connection with the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

The bill (S. 5108) to amend section 126 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before morning business is closed I want to make a suggestion in the way of seeking information of the able leader of the majority, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN].

A month ago the Senator announced that we were to begin retrenchment at once, and a few days thereafter a letter was read into the Record showing to what a remarkable extent retrenchment had already progressed. I read from yesterday morning's Post that "Government expenditures in November reached the new high record of \$1,935,249,000"—the highest figures we have reached since the war began. This is the first month of retrenchment. If the Senator has any explanation as to the progress of retrenchment, I should be delighted to hear it.

Mr. President, as I said sometime ago in discussing this matter, there will be a thousand reasons given for maintaining every expenditure which has been made during the war and every avenue of expenditure which has been authorized. I call attention to this matter this morning that we may understand that unless legislation is had and emergency bureaus and organizations are abolished and disposed of, the expenditures will continue just the same as they have during the war time. The Appropriations Committee must recommend the conservation of funds. It is the only way we can really make progress.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, since the Senator has appealed to me for some explanation about these expenditures I feel sure that he realizes that none of us can accomplish much along that line until some appropriation bills are ready for consideration. I have appealed for retrenchment as strongly as I could; I have been to the War Department repeatedly; I have written letters, and have endeavored in every way I could to induce a more economical administration of Government affairs.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what, if anything, has been done toward stopping the building of and expenditures with reference to Army cantonments?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I will say that the Secretary of War wrote me a letter that most of those contracts had been canceled. The enlargement of cantonments which was in contemplation, and for which in some instances contracts had been let, has been discontinued, with perhaps one exception. I do not know that the Secretary has stopped the construction of the project at Columbus, Ga., although I made a special visit to the War Department and inquired about it, and appealed to him, because I could not think it possible that we needed additional accommodations in cantonments when a million and a half soldiers would soon vacate the cantonments that we now have.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator has referred to the project at Columbus, Ga. The information that the people of that section of the country have had is that that is a permanent improvement and is intended for a war-instruction cantonment permanently for the instruction of officers of the Army. We are now informed down there that some \$13,000,000 is to be expended on that project.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I hope the Senator's information is incorrect. The Secretary of War told me that he was going to cut most of that out. He would not promise me absolutely to cancel the whole matter, but he said it would involve a very small expense.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hopes that the conversation is not a private one. The rest of us would like to hear it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I got permission of the Senator from Virginia, and I thought also of the Chair, to interrupt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly; but it is impossible to hear the Senator.

Mr. HARDWICK. What I want to say to the Senator is that publication has been made in the papers down there that that project is to be carried forward to completion. I have no information of an official character as to whether it is true or not; but the people down there whose lands are about to be condemned or who have had notice that their lands are to be condemned have got to have some knowledge of a reliable character, so that they will know how to conduct their private affairs. Probably 4,000 acres of land, involving farming lands in two counties, are embraced in this project, and the papers down there are publishing the statement that the Columbus, Ga., project is to be carried out in its entirety, regardless of the fact that the war is over.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what amount is supposed to be expended upon that project?

Mr. HARDWICK. It was stated in a rough way that \$13,000,000 would be expended upon it.

Mr. BORAH. That is the initial expenditure?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Then how much more will have to be expended upon it before we get through with it? And above all, what is the necessity of going ahead with any further expenditures?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think I can give some information in regard to this matter.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will be glad if anybody can.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The original project adopted by the War Department was to provide an Infantry training school, and it was intended to instruct 25,000 officers at a time. That was begun and worked out months ago. It was a consolidation and enlargement of training schools for Infantry, but when the armistice was declared at once steps were taken to reduce the scope of the project to a peace basis. It was contemplated from the first to provide space to train 2,500, I think, and this is a permanent part of the military system. The enlargement of the project to accommodate 25,000 was incident to the war. Immediately after the armistice was declared steps were taken to abandon the larger enterprise formed in connection with the war and to complete only the small enterprise which from the first was to be a permanent part of the Military Establishment. This was generally the plan.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him if he knows of any statute under which a permanent improvement of this character might be provided for?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There was a permanent school at Fort Sill, which was subsequently devoted to instruction exclusively in some other line, as I understand. I have not looked into the provision for the permanent school but think there has been such authority for some time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure that there is no special statute authorizing a permanent school of infantry and technical instruction.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator says there is such a statute?

Mr. McKELLAR. I say there is no special statute, but the work is being done under a statute which we enacted for war purposes. I understand there is no permanent statute authorizing the work, and while I am not sure I do not think that the plan can be carried out when peace is declared.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will allow me, I should like to ask him whether he has any information as to whether the War Department is going ahead with expenditures for permanent purposes under appropriations made for war purposes alone?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Does the Senator address the question to me?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no information on that subject. I will say that I have had several conversations with the Secretary of War on the subject of economizing on war expenditures, and he assured me that he was in full sympathy with that purpose and wrote me a letter, which I put in the Record, showing that he had cut off a billion and a third of dollars of contracts. He assured me further that he intended to pursue that policy and cut off expenditures as far as possible.

In addition to that, I will say, Mr. President, that I had a talk with him later on about the Columbus, Ga., expenditure, and he insisted that it would be necessary to expend some money there, but that he was going to curtail the project very greatly. I differed with him, and told him so, and I desire to express now my difference. I do not believe there ought to be one dollar expended there. If these expenditures for war purposes are to go on in time of peace, this country will be brought to bankruptcy. I protest against it as strongly as I can; and when the bills appropriating money come before the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, the Senate may rest assured that the pruning knife will be applied as rigidly as possible.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? In the last deficiency bill considered by the Congress there were two items asked for appropriations to buy target ranges—one, I think, in Florida, and the other in North Carolina. The committee, after a hearing, refused to make the appropriation.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I correct the Senator by saying that neither of those ranges was located in Florida? I think one was in West Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. One was in Kentucky and the other in North Carolina.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator for giving the correction as to the location. I have since been informed that the War De-

partment, notwithstanding the action of the committee, have purchased one of those sites, and I should like to know if that is so.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have no information on the subject except a newspaper paragraph which stated that they had bought the site in North Carolina at a cost of \$2,000,000. They asked for a million and a half, and the Committee on Appropriations struck it from the bill. The bill passed the House with that item in it. The Senate committee struck it out; the Senate sustained the committee, and the conference struck it out. So that if the War Department have expended \$2,000,000 for the purchase of that site they must have gotten it out of some general appropriation, some lump-sum appropriation made by the Committee on Military Affairs, and with full knowledge of the fact that the Congress had protested against it by refusing to appropriate it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have a letter in regard to the purchase of this site in North Carolina. The only reason why I do not insert the letter in the Record is because it reflects so severely upon those who had to do with it that I would not want to insert it until I had made a thorough investigation; but it is written by a business man who lives near the place. Now, if they have purchased this site in defiance of the action of the Appropriations Committee, and at the same time have purchased it at the figures which are given in proportion to the value as stated by this gentleman, the matter ought to be investigated.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, if that is true, why not investigate the purchase of this old hotel property here in Washington, where exactly the same thing happened? The committee refused to authorize it; it was struck out of the bill, and the President bought it out of his war fund—a building in the city of Washington—within 48 hours after we acted adversely on it.

Mr. BORAH. I can imagine that good use could be made of the Arlington Hotel property. Of course, that perhaps would not excuse the purchase of it after the Appropriations Committee refused to appropriate for it; but there is a different story connected with this other purchase, and that is the price paid in comparison to the value of the property.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. With reference to the Arlington Hotel site, I will say that the committee did not act on it. When it was first presented to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House had it under advisement; and we did not feel that it was expedient or wise for us to take it up under the circumstances. We did not pass judgment on it at all, because another committee, which had jurisdiction of the subject, had under consideration a bill providing for its purchase.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will yield, while that is true in one way, yet from another standpoint it is not exactly a fair statement—and, of course, the Senator does not intend to be unfair—as to what happened.

The Secretary of the Treasury came before the committee and asked to have the item included. After some investigation of the proposition, on a vote of the committee we voted not to include it and not to give him this power and authority, and within 48 hours after that action was taken it was bought from the President's \$100,000,000 war fund. That is the fact.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I do not think I am mistaken in saying that the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate did not consider it, for the reason that it was already under consideration by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is true.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. We expressed no opinion whatever about it. Personally I believe that if it had come before the Senate committee, if the House committee had not had it under consideration, the Senate committee would have included it, as I believe it was a wise purchase. The President purchased it, paid for it out of his emergency fund, and I believe under the conditions as they then existed it was a wise purchase. He got it at a fair price, and it is a much-needed building; it is a very valuable fireproof building that will be of permanent use to the Government work in the city of Washington.

Getting back, however, to this North Carolina purchase that the newspapers refer to, I know nothing whatever about it. I do not know whether the site has been purchased or not; but it was intended as a training ground for artillery. They told me up at the War Department that they expected to have a brigade of artillery in training there. It was not purchased for a target range. They have other places for that purpose. They have been very generously expending the public money about matters of this kind, and it was not pretended that they needed this as a place for testing artillery or for target practice, but it was for training artillery soldiers.

I can not conceive of a reason now for putting \$2,000,000 into the purchase of mountainous lands in North Carolina on which to train artillery for this Government. I hope the War Department has not done it. I most seriously protest against it; and if there is any way to stop it, if it has not gone so far that it can not be stopped, I will endeavor to stop it now.

Some members of the Military Affairs Committee told me that they would take up the matter at the War Department and get the facts. It was a matter that came more especially from them, for if the officials of the department have purchased it with any money they got the money from the Military Affairs Committee. They did not get it from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SMOOT. They may have gotten it out of a lump sum.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Not from the Appropriations Committee. That committee has made no lump-sum appropriations that could have been properly used for the purchase of that land in North Carolina. There was another similar tract of land that the War Department was talking about purchasing, and the department had in the bill a million and a half additional for the purchase of land in Kentucky for a similar purpose.

I think, Mr. President, that the time has come when these war expenditures must stop. We need all of our money and all of our energy and all of our resources to rehabilitate the industrial condition of this country, and we ought to cease expending money for war purposes. In all probability we will not have another war in 50 years. Certainly there is no occasion at this particular time to be expending millions and hundreds of millions in preparation for war.

Mr. BORAH, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, and Mr. KENYON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has lost track of who has the floor.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Virginia was answering a question which I propounded to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. That fact had escaped my notice. I thought the Senator was through and had yielded the floor.

Mr. BORAH. I am very glad to have had the Senator occupy the time. I know the Senator is acting in the utmost good faith in seeking to cut down expenditures.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor; otherwise I would not have consumed as much time as I have.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Virginia a question?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia if it is not a feasible matter to call together the Committee on Appropriations, take up these different appropriation bills, find out what remains to be spent and what can be cut out of these bills, and get down to brass tacks, instead of simply talking about it all of the time?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, in answer to that question, I will say that I am in constant touch and communication with Mr. SHERLEY, the very able chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations; and he has under way now an investigation for that purpose and expects to repeal laws appropriating billions of dollars which have not been expended. He has called on all of the departments of the Government to make a statement as to what amounts that have been appropriated remain unexpended; and he expects to incorporate in the next bill that he brings in, which will be in a very few weeks, provisions repealing these appropriations that are no longer necessary, in view of the peace that has now been practically proclaimed.

For instance, there was over a billion dollars appropriated for heavy artillery, which it would take more than 12 months to manufacture. The House incorporated that in the last deficiency bill. I sent for the Secretary of War, and he appeared before the Senate committee. Peace was then being talked about, but nothing tangible had developed. He said, "If peace is attained, I will not spend that money," and I have no idea that he will. He assured the committee that he would not; but we did not feel that we could strike it out at that time, because the war was on, and we felt that it would put the country in a false position. We did not want it to go forth to our enemies that we were letting up in preparing to meet their attacks.

Mr. KENYON. Would it not be advantageous to bring in the heads of these bureaus and find out how many of this army of clerks can be spared, and spared now?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I appeal to the chairman of the committee to do that.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I shall certainly pursue that policy, but I did not think it was necessary to do it until we had an appropriation bill before us. We will certainly take it up at that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Mexico? He has been standing for half an hour.

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I did not understand the inquiry made by the Senator from Idaho to invite discussion of particular transactions. I rather assumed that the Senator from Idaho was seeking some light upon the general subject of the reduction of expenses.

It may be enlightening to the Senator and to the Senate to know that this morning the Secretary of War and Gen. Ward appeared before the Finance Committee and made a statement upon that subject; and without going into matters of detail at all, the estimate was submitted to the Finance Committee that after caring for all authorizations in excess of appropriations, and after paying all of the bills for the fiscal year, there would remain a saving out of the actual appropriation of about seven and a quarter billion dollars. I believe it is that information that the Senator from Idaho was seeking. That is an indication of what the War Department is doing. It was quite evident from the testimony of the Secretary this morning that every effort is being made to reduce these expenses; and as the sum total of the information which he gave to the committee, he estimated that all of the expenses would be paid for the fiscal year 1919, all of the authorizations and contracts made could be cared for, and result in a net saving out of the actual appropriations of something like seven and a quarter billion dollars.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, may I ask the Senator in that connection whether the Secretary of War has made any statement to the Military Affairs Committee, to the Finance Committee, or to any other committee of which the Senator has knowledge, as to how rapidly the soldiers in Europe are to be brought home?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Secretary stated to the committee this morning that arrangements are being made to have the soldiers brought home as rapidly as possible; that is, all that will not be needed, under the arrangement with our allies, to perform certain duties in Europe for some months to come.

Mr. BORAH. I saw the statement in the press that it is contemplated to keep a million and a quarter soldiers practically permanently in Europe. I should like to know if there is any such idea as that in the mind of anybody who has any connection with this Government. I shall take an interest in any program like that.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I can answer the Senator's question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps the President means until the signing of peace.

Mr. BORAH. The press did not so limit the statement.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I will answer the question of the Senator, if permitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas. He is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and I shall be glad to have him answer the question.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, the statement made to the Military Affairs Committee by the Secretary of War on yesterday or day before yesterday was that 1,250,000 men, practically 30 divisions, would remain in Europe; that the rest of them would be brought home and demobilized and mustered out as rapidly as transportation facilities could be obtained. As to how long these 30 divisions would remain in Europe, or what particular purpose was to be accomplished by their remaining there, any further than could be gathered generally by everybody, there was no statement made by the Secretary of War. That is the condition as far as it has been disclosed to the Military Affairs Committee. As I understand, we have not yet asked for any more specific information, but we expect to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In view of this statement, I desire to call attention to the provision attached by unanimous consent to the appropriation bill of last year which limits the retention of the reserve army to four months after the proclamation of peace; and without additional legislation none of the reserve army can be kept in the Army longer than four months after the declaration of peace. That provision is clearly and em-

phatically carried in the appropriation bill in a provision passed subsequently to the original military bill, which used the term "the present emergency." Desiring to get away from that indefinite language, "the present emergency," we put in the express language "four months after the proclamation of peace" in legislation passed subsequently to the bill which carried "the present emergency," and that four-months limitation stands as the law to-day.

Mr. BORAH. When does the four-months limitation begin to run?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. From the proclamation of peace, the declaration of peace.

Mr. BORAH. I see.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But I only mentioned it to show that unless legislation is had there can be no million of men kept indefinitely in Europe by any kind of agreement.

Mr. BORAH. I can understand the necessity of retaining men in Europe, though not in large numbers, until the treaty of peace is signed; but these publications to the effect that they are to remain there indefinitely naturally lead to inquiry as to what "indefinitely" means.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] suggests that it is impossible to get them home. We got them over there at the rate of about 300,000 a month. When we get ready we can perhaps get them home with reasonable speed.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator will excuse me, I simply want to add one word to what the Senator from Georgia stated. The law that limits their retention in the service to four months has also a provision, reading, in substance, "and such additional time as may be necessary to get transportation and bring them home."

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. NEW. Referring to the point the Senator from Georgia has just made, I call attention to the fact that it is provided by the law that all of the conscriptions and all of the enlistments in the Regular Army made subsequently to the passage of that law expire within four months after the signing of the declaration of peace. The enlistments in the Regular Army that were made prior to that date were for a longer term, and I suppose those men will stay in the Army until the expiration of the period for which they enlisted.

In making the statement that 30 divisions were to be kept on the other side, the Chief of Staff said that they were to be Regular Army divisions; that there were to be replacements; that the divisions were to be so arranged that as finally constituted they would be composed of soldiers in the Regular Army; and that all others of the National Army, the National Guard, and all that, were to be returned home. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding that there are only about 40,000 men left in the Regular Army who were enlisted prior to the passage of the act limiting the period of their service to four months after the signing of the declaration of peace. Now, I am interested in knowing how we are to make up the difference between that forty or fifty thousand, possibly, who are left in and the 1,200,000 who are to be kept over there.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator did he inquire of the Chief of Staff in regard to that matter?

Mr. NEW. No; I did not; but that question presented itself, and it would be interesting to know if anyone has any information on the subject, so that this discrepancy may be provided for.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I believe I shall defer this matter for a season. But the subject shall not be permitted to die. I have no desire to criticize nor find fault, but I am going to do as I promised the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]—give him my persistent and vigilant support in pulling down these enormous expenditures.

DELBERT JAMES HAFF.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, upon yesterday a species of debate arose between the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and me concerning a phrase in a letter from a man by the name of Haff, as I understand it, addressed to the Senator from Missouri. This morning I received a letter from a friend of mine at the other wing of the Capitol, which is a personal letter, the conclusion of which is—

Don't forget that this conspicuous Republican may not be entirely unprejudiced politically in his criticism. More strength to your right arm.

And with this he sends me a transcript from Who's Who, giving the history and the corporate and Mexican connections of Haff. I ask that the transcript from Who's Who be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Who's Who (1916-1917), p. 1027.]

Haff, Delbert James, lawyer; b. Oakland Co., Mich., Feb. 19, 1859; admitted to Michigan bar 1885; practiced alone, Kansas City, 1886-9; member of firm Haff & Van Valkenburg, 1889-96; practiced alone, 1896-1900; practiced with William C. Michaels, 1900-11; practiced with firm of Haff, Meservey, German, and Michaels; general counsel Nacozari R. R. Co., Mexico; also of Montezuma Copper Company, Cananea Consolidated Copper Co., Lucky Tiger Combination Gold Mining Co. Director and general attorney, Kansas City, of the Mexico & Orient Railroad Co. Director Commerce Trust Company. President Board Park Commissioners, Kansas City, 1910-12. * * * Republican. Life member American Unitarian Association; trustee All Souls' Church. Member Mexican Academy Jurisprudence and Legislation (only American member); American Society International Law; American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes; American Economic Association; National Municipal League; American Civic Association; Phi Beta Kappa, etc. Scottish Rite Mason (32d degree). Clubs: American (City of Mexico), University, Kansas City, Blue Hills Country, Midway, Commercial, City, etc. Home, 416 East 36th Street; office, 906 Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo.

STRUCTURES ON UNION STATION PLAZA.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to have some information from the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds as to why the temporary structures occupying the park between the Capitol and the Union Station, originally designed for housing war workers who came to the city in large numbers, are being continued, and continued at large expense, and for any purpose other than that for which they were originally designed to be used.

Mr. SWANSON. I will say to the Senator that I was absent from the city until about 10 days ago, and as soon as I came back I took up the matter. I was informed by those in charge of the housing proposition, not only in Washington but elsewhere, that only those buildings which have gone beyond the process of commencement and which could be utilized were being constructed, as it would cost less to complete those buildings in a reasonable time than to stop the construction now. I understand that it is the purpose of the Housing Commission not to start any new buildings, and that the program outlined is to complete only those in process of construction where the cost would be less to complete them than if left uncompleted. I am not the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and have not been for nearly three months. Consequently I am not acquainted with all the details of the various propositions which were included in the housing act.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SWANSON. I will.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Does the Senator understand that one or two of the buildings now in the course of construction on the Capitol Plaza are to be used for picture shows? The one with the gilded dome is to be devoted to that patriotic purpose. The Government has gone to enormous expense to build these houses, which presumably will be torn down in a few months. There was no necessity for the picture-show houses even if the war had gone on for years. There were plenty of places of amusement for these patriotic war workers. It is horrible to think that this expense should have been incurred by the Government for the purpose of giving somebody profits on the construction.

Mr. SWANSON. I am not familiar with that. All the buildings were needed for war workers at the time when they were commenced. I see no occasion for completing any of the buildings, except where the loss would be greater not to complete them than it would be to discontinue work upon them.

Mr. WALSH. The question I desire to ask the Senator is how there could be any loss in stopping that would be greater than the loss of completion.

Mr. SWANSON. If we had a building half completed and made arrangements to rent it, and it could be completed in three or four weeks, under those circumstances I think it would be cheaper to complete it.

Mr. WALSH. I agree with the Senator about that, but that is not the question. To what use is it proposed now to put these buildings that were constructed for the purpose of housing war workers?

Mr. SWANSON. The departments, I understand, will be overcrowded for some time. I understand it is the purpose to rent these buildings by authority of the Government and to collect the rent.

Mr. KIRBY. May I ask the Senator a question on the rent proposition?

Mr. SWANSON. That is my understanding. I will say I do not know definitely, because I was away from the city for two months on account of illness in my family. I am not acquainted with the facts, and I have not been chairman of the committee for over three months. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KIRBY. It is my information that the Housing Commission have put a price on its accommodations furnished in the houses built by the Government that is as high as that charged by the people of Washington, and that was done, I suppose, to

keep up the price to something like what the real estate men in Washington thought would furnish them a reasonable compensation. I understand the buildings were to be erected for the accommodation of war workers and to reduce the exorbitant price that had been charged on the outside. I have stated what has been my information as to the price fixed for people who have made arrangements to take possession of the buildings. Does the Senator know anything about it?

Mr. SWANSON. I understood the buildings were to be rented at a rate by which the Government would get about 5 or 6 per cent on the money invested. I feel that that is justified as a rental from any class of citizens. It was impossible to get buildings constructed here to take care of the war workers from various sections of the country, and the Government contemplated putting up these buildings and renting them, getting about 5 or 6 per cent return for the money invested. As to whether that has been executed or not, I am not prepared to say, nor as to what the charges are to be.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I am glad the Senator from Montana has brought up this question. These buildings very largely are being erected on public parks in Washington. They are being erected for a specific purpose. That purpose will disappear as soon as the urgency of the war pressure is removed and there will immediately be a pressure to pull the buildings down. If one will take a paper and pencil and figure up a moment or two, even based on the explanation which the Senator from Virginia has made, he will be able to determine that there will not be any reasonable return on the money, because the buildings have cost excessive amounts, and, in my judgment, work on those buildings should be stopped at once; it does not make any difference if they are seven-eighths completed.

Mr. SWANSON. The idea was that the Government could recoup itself for some of its expenditures. Of course the removal is finally to be determined by Congress. If Congress wants to remove them next week or a year or two years hence, Congress will determine as to whether the buildings put on these parks shall be removed or whether the Government shall obtain rent enough to get a reasonable compensation for the expenditure made or not.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield that I may put this proposition to him? It is obvious that after the completion of the buildings hundreds of thousands of dollars—at any rate, a very large sum—will be necessary to furnish them.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That is being done now. They are putting the furniture in now.

Mr. SWANSON. I see that the chairman of the committee, Mr. REED, is present. I am satisfied that it is his purpose to make a thorough investigation of the entire expenditures in connection with housing all over the United States. I am not acquainted with it either here or elsewhere, but the amount of money spent elsewhere exceeds that in Washington. Of course the condition all over the country should be investigated and a policy outlined.

Mr. KING. I believe every dollar spent on those buildings now will be wasted, and it is a crime to continue any work on the buildings.

Mr. SWANSON. I am not prepared to say as to what would be the wiser course to pursue.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word. I do not understand that the primary purpose of constructing the buildings was to bring down the price of the rent of apartments in Washington, but the primary purpose, as I understand it, was to provide accommodations for war workers who could not find accommodations in the city, and the Government very properly undertook to provide accommodations. Up to the time that the armistice was declared the war workers were housed somewhere, and as a matter of course the number would be immediately diminished thereafter rather than increased. So it occurs to me that there never will be any occasion whatever for the use of these buildings for the purpose for which they were erected—to take care of war workers who could not find accommodations anywhere else. It occurs to me, therefore, that that is one of the things that should have been stopped the day after the armistice was declared, taking whatever loss was occasioned by reason of the construction already made. But I have observed day by day that the work goes on. I observe that the buildings are being fitted out with furniture, curtains are put at the windows, the grounds are being very nicely graded, and I presume probably lawns will be cultivated and all the attractions of the home will be attendant upon them.

They are very costly buildings that are in process of construction upon the Plaza; they are quite artistic in the style of architecture. I do not know to what purpose they could be

devoted, but that ground was acquired for park purposes, and consequently the buildings there erected are going to be razed in the course of a very short time. As suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], I can not conceive how the Government can ever get back the money that it is even now expending in the construction of the buildings.

Mr. SWANSON. I could not express a definite opinion on the subject unless I knew what is the program outlined after the completion of the buildings and the rent expected and what would be saved out of the appropriation. I understand the policy is to complete the buildings, except where it is better for the Government to abandon them. Of course, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which the Senator from Missouri is the chairman, will think over this matter and ascertain the expenditures. We can rely upon the energy of the Senator from Missouri to pursue the matter to the fullest extent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will yield, I want to ask him who is managing the construction of the buildings and furnishing them down on the Plaza? It does seem to me we ought to get hold of whoever is doing it and choke them off from buying furniture and putting it into those buildings now. It is simply an inexcusable waste of public money, and the person responsible ought to be named and pilloried for it.

Mr. SWANSON. When the housing bill was before the Senate authority was given to the President to control the expenditure of the money. A Housing Commission was provided for under the bill as originally passed by the House. It was amended in the Senate by putting the President in control of it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is legislation that I am glad I voted against. I insisted that we ought to name some responsible person to do work of this kind, an officer of the United States Government on whom we could put our hands and have some influence over.

NEWS CABLE SERVICE IN PARIS.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, we have heard very much of late about the mode of communication between Paris and this country of the peace conference proceedings, and we have been told that there would be no restriction upon the news which would come to us respecting those proceedings. I am very glad indeed that we have thus been told, and I take it that that will be the fact. But in order that the Senate may be informed, for perhaps some have not read the particular dispatch, I wish to read a dispatch appearing this morning in the Washington Post from Paris upon this subject:

NEEDS OF 500 WRITERS EXCEED CABLE CAPACITY; 28,000 WORDS IS LIMIT.
PARIS, December 4.

With the arrival to-day from England of Edgar Sisson, accompanied by 5 assistants and 30 clerks, the advance guard of the Creel committee established itself here in anticipation of President Wilson's visit to Paris. They are quartered in a handsome 20-room house at 58 Avenue Montaigne, in the vicinity of the Champs Elysees. A housekeeper and a corps of servants had been provided in advance for the party.

It was explained to-night by a member of the party that every American official communication to the press must pass Mr. Creel.

Mr. Sisson in a talk with American correspondents here defined the objects of the committee during the peace negotiations.

The mission's function, said Mr. Sisson, would be solely to issue authentic statements on behalf of the American negotiators, designed to prevent mistakes that might creep into the American and foreign press if such a centralized system of authentic outgivings were not devised.

With the approach of President Wilson's arrival and the coming of the various peace delegates a unique situation in the history of telegraphic communication is expected to present itself. The cables between England and America are capable of transmitting 28,000 news words daily—positively no more, officials state. When it was reported the *Orizaba* would bring 500 writers, those here familiar with the capacity of the telegraph and cable connections expressed pessimism as to the possibility of giving every member of the huge army of correspondents a fair chance. There are only three cables supplying England, America, and Canada.

Already a plan has been set afoot for "rationing" wire space among the various news associations and individual reporters.

Mr. President, I am not concerned with the legal aspects of the President's trip. He determined to take it and we make the best of his determination. I am concerned with what may come to America of the proceedings of the peace conference, and I am concerned with whether the news that comes to us shall be "rationed" or whether it shall be censored.

I wanted to call the attention of my colleagues to this news item sent by cable from Paris so that they might, with me, if their views be similar to mine, protest against Mr. Creel "rationing" news from Paris or exercising censorship over that which shall come to us from the peace conference.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I had intended myself to read the article which has just been read by the distinguished Senator from California. I am very glad that he has called the attention of the Senate and of the country to this particular censorship. The article that he has read and the information

it gives is in striking contrast with the language used by the President in the address that he delivered to Congress the other day, in which he said:

I shall be in close touch with you and with affairs on this side the water, and you will know all that I do. At my request, the French and English Governments have absolutely removed the censorship of cable news which until within a fortnight they had maintained and there is now no censorship whatever exercised at this end except upon attempted trade communications with enemy countries. It has been necessary to keep an open wire constantly available between Paris and the Department of State and another between France and the Department of War. In order that this might be done with the least possible interference with the other uses of the cables, I have temporarily taken over the control of both cables in order that they may be used as a single system. I did so at the advice of the most experienced cable officials, and I hope that the results will justify my hope that the news of the next few months may pass with the utmost freedom and with the least possible delay from each side of the sea to the other.

And is also strikingly inconsistent with a statement issued by the Postmaster General, as published in the Official Bulletin of the 3d of December, in which he says:

An understanding has been had with those who have the immediate direction of the trans-Atlantic cable service that every facility commensurate with its importance will be given the news associations and representatives of individual newspapers for handling press matter during the period of the peace conference. It is hoped that these agencies may be given the fullest opportunities for handling the development of the peace deliberation. No discrimination will be permitted; and press matter at press rates will, where possible to do so, not be shunted aside but handled promptly so as not to impair its value as news.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.
Mr. WALSH. I know the Senator from Indiana has given very careful consideration to the subject of the cables, and I ask him to advise the Senate what is the daily capacity of the cables?

Mr. WATSON. I think that this article correctly states the capacity allotted to the press. I have not much doubt about that. I am not complaining about that.

Mr. WALSH. Then let me inquire of the Senator if some system of rationing will not be absolutely necessary?

Mr. WATSON. I want to say to the Senator from Montana that I am not complaining so much about the system of rationing as I am about the man who is to do the rationing; in other words, here is the proposition:

It was explained to-night by a member of the party that every American official communication to the press must pass Mr. Creel.

Who is to determine what is an "official communication"?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President; I did not intend to interrupt any animadversion that the Senator from Indiana might care to make with respect to that feature of it, but I merely desired to get the information myself as to whether, if the cables are limited in their capacity—and, of course, they are—some system of rationing will not be necessary.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, will my colleague permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.
Mr. NEW. I think, in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Montana, that it is fair to say that the total capacity of the cables between this country and Europe is much in excess of 28,000 words a day, but those 28,000 words referred to are already that portion of the capacity of the cables which has been rationed to the American press for their purposes.

Mr. WATSON. That is what I understand this article to mean.

Mr. NEW. It has been rationed to the American press for news purposes, and those 28,000 words are in turn to be parceled out by Mr. Creel in the capacity in which he is to act over there, as I understand.

Mr. WALSH. That is the information which I was desirous of getting. I should assume that, as a matter of course, some portion of the total capacity of the cables will necessarily be assigned by some one for the transmission of commercial and other general news.

Mr. NEW. Certainly.
Mr. WALSH. So that if the demands upon the cables are greater than their ability to meet them some system of rationing must be put in force by some one in order to meet the situation.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana has concluded, I desire to say that my contention was at the time I made the remarks I made upon this floor when the cables were taken over that George Creel was to be taken to France in order that he might censor all the news that came to this country regarding the deliberations at the peace council. That is exactly what I believed then, and it is precisely what I believe now. This article simply confirms me in that opinion. I am not disturbed about the rationing; I am not disturbed about the capacity of the cables; but I am disturbed about the fact

that the man who is to have absolute charge of every word that comes to this country respecting the deliberations of the peace council is George Creel and that George Creel was taken there for the express purpose of censoring it all and having charge of it all. That is what I complain of; and I again want to warn the American people that if George Creel is to send the words here and is to transmit the news here and if nothing is to be put on the wire except the things which he approves they should make very great allowance for their truthfulness and for their authenticity. It is for that purpose that I rose, and that only.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] I think have performed a needed public service in calling attention to the press reports referred to, as well as to a paragraph in the recent message just before the departure of the Executive in relation to the same subject.

I am not at all surprised at the exercise of the power, now that it has been assumed by Mr. Creel, having first been delegated and made possible by affirmative action in Congress. Congress has very largely been derelict in permitting such power to be delegated. I expected it to be unwisely exercised, and I fear I shall not be disappointed. I would be very glad to know otherwise, but the press report cabled from Paris under the date line read by the Senator from California and referred to by the Senator from Indiana only confirms what every Senator in this body believes, what every well-informed man in the press gallery knows, and what the general public who have given attention to the matter believe and know to be the purpose of the power so delegated. It was to muzzle the press, and for no other purpose, and I again call the public's attention to the fact that it will be exercised in that way.

I saw evidence of the purpose for which this power was to be used when the resolution was introduced which made possible the taking of the cables. After the belated action, the armistice having been signed, the cables were taken over. It was only cumulative evidence of the intent with which power was originally sought and was finally obtained. It is now being used in the way that every person here who gave the matter thought expected it to be used.

The very great array of clerical and other help taken by the head of the Committee on Public Information would betoken some expense to be paid out of the \$1,250,000 heretofore appropriated by Congress for the support of this agency. I have no doubt there will be additional appropriations sought at the hands of Congress before it shall have completed its purposes. The conditions under which they render this service and the particular accommodations required—all of which are heralded in the very liberal arrangements made—would warrant the belief that other appropriations will be needed. The article here speaks of the "20-room house." Of course, the commissary must go along with that. Such needed help as would support in befitting state a representative of a public department of this Government would naturally occasion considerable expense. I have heretofore called attention to the very liberal arrangements that were made for the entertainment and support of this party abroad, of which Mr. Creel is only a portion. Such luxuries come high, but the administration must have them, and the people must foot the bills.

The expense of the cable service to the fathers and the mothers of the soldiers in the service has not been reduced since the Government acquired the cables.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. NEW. Before the Senator leaves that subject, I have heard it reported that among the other accessories provided and which were taken over on the *George Washington* were 12 new automobiles, just recently purchased. Does the Senator include them in the articles for which appropriations will probably be asked?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that appropriations will be necessary. Of course, what is necessary to support a mission of this kind is discretionary and depends upon the liberal ideas of those in authority and their desire to entertain and to give such éclat to the thing as might be considered essential, and a large number of automobiles might be thought necessary to that end. I am glad to have the Senator from Indiana call attention to this particular item of expenditure, which no doubt in due season will be before this body. It will furnish at least the foundation for appropriate comments in the absence of a majority vote against appropriations of that kind, if a seasonable statement is had, as the Senator from Indiana has already made it. It comes fitly, indeed, at a time when we have been for months admonished to save and diet and give. Advice in abundance but no example by those in authority.

Before leaving this matter, I was about to refer to the fact that when the cables were in private hands a special 6-cent rate per word was made possible by the private management of the cables to the parents of soldiers who desired to communicate with the capitals of the belligerent nations with which we are associated for the purpose of finding the latest news of their boys in the service. Since the Government has taken over the cables the old rate of 28 cents a word is now applicable to every father and mother who desires to cable to Europe to find out where their boys are. That is the old general rate. The 6-cent rate was a special rate made by the alleged "grasping private concerns" that owned the cables before the Government took them over. So much for promoting publicity and reasonable charges when they affect the sons of families, many of whom have not been heard from for months.

I have a neighbor in my home city who has three boys and one son-in-law in the service. All of them are enlisted men; they did not wait for the draft. One of the boys has not been heard of for more than three months, and the department is now cabling across trying to locate the whereabouts of this absent member. Some of the boys have been heard from, but as to this one about whom there is anxiety more than three months have elapsed without a word. It costs 28 cents a word to cable to London or to any other quarter reached by cable line under the beneficent management of the lines by Mr. Burleson, Postmaster General. I wish to add that to the benefits accruing from the cable seizure along with those Mr. Creel has already furnished.

I alluded, Mr. President, the other day to the fact that a good deal of expense would be incurred. I have here six Hoover menus prepared for Thanksgiving Day, which have just about as much to do with real benefit to the public as Mr. Creel's direction of the publicity service. They tell us what to eat; the Government reached those details long ago. These menus have been published since the armistice has been signed, and they provide six bills of fare for six days in the week, directing us how to subsist, running all the way from roast turkey and sweet potatoes down to roast goose and apple sauce—I am quoting literally from the bill of fare. So long as we are engaged in directing the individual what to do I should like to add that to the information the Senator from California has given on the sort of mental pabulum that should go along with physical nourishment. I ask that the menus referred to may be incorporated in the *Record* without reading as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SIX HOOVER MENUS ISSUED—"HOME-GROWN" THANKSGIVING DINNER URGED BY FOOD BOARD.

WASHINGTON, November 26, 1918.

Thanksgiving dinners of "extreme simplicity" are advocated by the Food Administration, which calls to mind that more than 300,000,000 people in the Eastern Hemisphere need food. The Food Administration says that a "home-grown" dinner is recommended, with simple menu, no waste, no imported food, and economy in the use of fats. "Feasting" during the holiday season is discouraged.

"Even with the armistice in effect the need for food saving with a view to world relief is greater than ever," says an announcement to-day. The Food Administration suggests any one of these six simple menus as "appropriate and patriotic":

1. Roast turkey, potato stuffing, glazed sweet potatoes, string beans, pickles, turnips, onions, pumpkin pie.
2. Roast chicken, potato and celery stuffing, cranberry jelly, steamed squash, oyster plant, nuts, celery and apple salad (use locally grown nuts), plum pudding.
3. Roast pork, baked apples, cranberry jelly, squash, turnips, tomato salad (home canned tomatoes), marshmallow pudding.
4. Roast rabbit, creole stuffing, glazed sweet potatoes, cranberry sauce, head lettuce salad with mayonnaise, celery, locally grown nuts, Indian pudding with raisins.
5. Roast goose, potato and walnut stuffing, apple sauce, giblet gravy, fried carrots, canned peas, fruit salad, sweet-potato pie.
6. Roast wild duck stuffed with apples, Belgian baked potatoes, stuffed olives, fried tomatoes, escalloped egg plant, cabbage salad, cranberry and apple pudding with cranberry pudding sauce.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, in addition to that, to show the latest activities of Mr. Creel before he left our shores, I wish to read from the Official Bulletin under date of November 22, 1918.

Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark, unfathom'd caves of ocean bear;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen
And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

And, Mr. President, here is one of them. An imperative sense of public duty prompts me to rescue from the oblivion of the Official Bulletin of November 22, 1918, this Kohinoor of food conservation:

MORE THAN THREE MEALS WASTEFUL, FOOD ADMINISTRATION SAYS.

The real work—

This refers to farm life. The gentleman who will censor all of the news that may come to the public from Paris, having reached

there with his vanguard of custodians of public information, prints this for the edification of the public—

The real work of farm life leaves little time or appetite for afternoon teas and late suppers. Nevertheless the request of the Food Administration that the fourth meal be discontinued until food conditions are less serious suggests to all people simple hospitality. Company for dinner or supper should mean to the earnest woman a real chance to teach conservation in an agreeable form. The church supper or community dinner, too, presents an opportunity to demonstrate how good is a dinner of simple home products and when well cooked should be a substitute for one of the three regular meals.

The extra meal and lavishness in food ought to be considered an offense against humanity and good taste so long as war-torn Europe needs to be comforted and fed.

The genius who discovered this priceless gem, Mr. President, ought not to be suffered to languish in obscurity. Here is something real satisfying to the farmer. Many of us from the western section of the country have constituents in the farming communities, and I know that they will welcome with hilarious delight the information furnished them in the Official Bulletin of November 22, 1918. The farmer is solemnly warned to abstain from pink teas and after-theater late suppers. I have not known any among my rural constituency who have recently been giving any teas of a winter or summer afternoon. I lately visited my home and many other of the Western States, and I know none of them who are engaged in that practice. Most of them have all of the members of their families out from dawn until dark trying to keep the food resources of this country from going to waste, in order that the starving ones of the world may be fed. I have seen children eight years of age kept out of school to take the places of the boys who are in the Army. They are not wasting food, and they need no advice from these self-constituted custodians of conservation, who do not know the first principles of production and whose entire lives, Mr. President, have been those of ultimate consumers, usually without any production on their part to be credited at any time to any of their activities.

I know of nothing that Mr. Creel ever produced in his life. He never even rolled a cigar that he smokes. He never produced a pound of cereals. He never milled any of them. He never raised a pound of meat of any kind. He does not know where the sources of production are in this country; and yet he not only censors our news from abroad but he undertakes to tell us how to live, how to produce, to eat, and even how to furnish our tables. For one, I am weary, and I shall seasonably protest here at all times and take the necessary course in the Senate to call the attention of the public generally to the expenditure of money to support a public officer for such superfluous service.

Ah, but this is a seasonable and thrice-blessed admonition, Mr. President, indeed! If it were not for this, the farmer by this time would be shucking corn in a silk tile and dress suit, with a caddie to attend him, to carry his husking gloves and swear at the mules; the Government must intervene to make him abstain from such luxuries by giving him this admonition in the Official Bulletin. His wife would be out with an 8 or 10 foot train, Mr. President, milking the cows, sitting on a mahogany stool with ebony legs, unless the Official Bulletin had thrown itself into the deadly breach.

The basement church supper is referred to here—a very necessary institution, and one with which we are all entirely familiar, both in the city and in the country towns. It is to be utilized as a substitute for one of the three regular meals. The other meal can be saved for the Hun, who may otherwise starve, since he has quit robbing others for his daily bread. This suggestion of Mr. Creel's possesses both novelty and utility. My information from "dry" headquarters is that the country will soon be in that condition. Free-lunch belts are rapidly fading from metropolitan centers. The church meal will furnish the nourishment without the alcoholic excitement. The degenerate rural gourmand, who yearns for caviare and nine kinds of liquor while he shovels potatoes into the root house, must be rebuked. "Simple home products" are the thing. Yes, indeed! He refers to them in the Official Bulletin. Well, let us begin at home. That is a good place, like charity. Let it begin there, but let it not remain there forever, of course. Let the presidential party that has now sailed fill its commissary with turnips, corn meal, and cabbages. Practice what you preach. Besides, it is popularly supposed that a simple diet of that kind and of such well-known articles will ward off seasickness. It will set a salutary example in high official life for the gourmandizing farmer who is now working 18 hours a day and helping feed the world. Lavish consumption of food at sea is often not assimilated or kept in the digestive tract for any great length of time; and if simplicity in diet were followed on the articles mentioned a great saving would result not only in comfort but to feed war-torn Europe, as well as recommending the simple life as a great public example.

I shall await further information on this subject with consuming impatience from the majority side of this Chamber, and from the press report from time to time by wireless, as it flashes on its way across the sea the news of this cavalcade to the peace council.

Rear Admiral Dr. Grayson and Creel both are of this retinue, as I have been informed. The admiral is a little late, wherever he is, to lend his presence to the imposing pageant of the German Navy's surrender. He ought to have been present. The world knows how much he contributed to breaking down Germany's sea power. Creel is the editor of the Official Bulletin, advising the farmer how to eat. With two such eminent authorities at the command of the country, the medical aspect of the balanced ration and a news report of the distinguished party in the act of taking nourishment are anxiously awaited.

I wish to say something, Mr. President, somewhat connected with this subject, addressed to the claim that every time some criticism is made it is an embarrassment or a heckling of the Executive or of the administration. We would have said the same things if he had stayed here; and why, in the language of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], is it to be taken as heaping things upon his defenseless head when he is gone? If a Senator, knowing that another one is to make some remarks about him, absents himself from his seat, the Senator remaining and still making the remarks is at liberty to say what he will in the Senator's absence. He can be present or not, as he likes.

At the other end of the Capitol, and among those who are impatient to mount the seat of power, there are interviews now anticipating the time when he shall rule. Edicts are issued from time to time, one in yesterday morning's press, saying that nothing should be said to interfere with the President's mission abroad. He must be immune in Congress and Creel must save him from a free press by censored cables. The gentleman seems to be impatient. He delivers his pronouncement with the air of finality and the authority of a sultan; his ukase is made and published before he has even ascended the throne of power. He is much more powerful in Washington than he is at home. Upon two several occasions he has been seized with an unappeasable desire to have the delegates from his own State in a national convention. He never even nosed in under the starter's wire and got a delegate in his life. I shall be indifferent to instructions from this self-constituted dictator of the Republican Party hailing from Illinois, even if he does presume to have absorbed the Republican Party and be intent upon delivering orders to his future subjects. I am mentioning no names, as it would be a breach of the parliamentary rules to do so.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The occupants of the galleries must preserve order.

Mr. SHERMAN. But I have not accepted his leadership, except when I was reconciled to defeat and expected the party to go into the ditch, and I never have been disappointed. He possesses no elements of leadership in the West, and none in his own State, outside of Hyde Park in South Chicago.

This is all I care to say at the present time; but I give due and timely warning that even if he be Speaker of the House his premature decrees do not bind the junior Senator from that State, nor will he be heeded in Illinois. I have had my difficulties with him in days past, and few there have ever paid any attention to him, because ordinarily it is not required; but because of his putative speakership he seems to be impatiently anticipating the day when he can deliver orders. If he wishes to lead, he will have to find some constituents outside his own State. He has never led his own State, and is unlikely to do so, and I respectfully suggest to him to represent something before he begins to publish proclamations and bestride the Republican Party in anticipation of his reign. Nobody will address him as the Muskingum County, Ohio, Democrats spoke of President Wilson. He will be "His Majesty" to nobody, not even to his own constituents. It is only by forbearance that he ever gets to Congress. It speaks well for the pursuits of private life in his district that nobody wants the place. Everybody would rather stay in Hyde Park than contest his seat. He can be spared for exile in Washington, and so they bid him Godspeed.

At one time he affably referred to the Senator now having the floor as a "two spot." I replied that such limited familiarity as I had possessed of the game in which that was an element had taught me that it was something you could not lose, and we contested to see who had the highest card in the pack. He started his campaign, he had his headquarters, he issued his literature, and after a casual observation of the political landscape he retired, and his name was not heard of thereafter. I hope he will not give me an occasion for further remarks; but if he does I shall be very happy at all times to promote harmony of the kind indicated.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I desire to ask if he is withdrawing the candidate for the speakership at this time? I want to know whether Champ Clark is to have an open field?

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, he is welcome to it as far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned. [Laughter.] I am cheerfully impartial, Mr. President. As between the two, I would not say even that I was "from Missouri." I would just as lief the honor would go to one as the other, personally. I suppose, politically, I ought to be loyal. We worked for the majority in the House; I contributed my drop in the bucket with the others; but I wish to warn the Republicans of the House and the Republicans of the United States, if they wish to dissipate their majority, let them choose such leaders and go into the ditch again. He belongs to that band of distinguished Tories who never learned anything and who never forgot anything, because they had not anything to forget.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms and his assistants at different doors must warn the occupants of the galleries about the rules of the Senate. The Chair is tired of calling attention to the rules. The doorkeepers are put there to know something. Let them tell the occupants of the galleries what the rules are.

Mr. SHERMAN. So, if there is to be a leadership, it ought to garner the result of a campaign usefully; but this alleged leader has never led. His proclamations are received with tumultuous laughter and his efforts to manage the party are accepted as notice to prepare for its obsequies. He is suffering from an obsession that a parliamentary rule is of more consequence than a constitutional limitation or delegated power in that instrument. He has dwelt in the atmosphere of parliamentary ruts so long that he has never learned to distinguish between the one and the other; and I think it my duty to warn Republicans that if they are to learn by lessons beginning in 1912 and extending to the 5th of November, 1918, they might as well consider maturely, with him in the saddle, where they are headed for and what kind of a leader they are following.

Probably I ought to be a Member of the other body. I could have gone there 20 years ago from the Rock Island district if I had wished. I would enjoy life better there, no doubt. I have this to say of the House, however: They had better cast about to get a leader that has a constituency at home and his own State behind him; and this that putative candidate never had, and he never will.

The rest of it I will say upon due provocation at some other time, if it comes. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any further morning business? [A pause.] Is any Senator desirous of discussing anything? [Laughter.] If not, the morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hardwick	Moses	Smith, Md.
Borah	Henderson	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Johnson, Cal.	Nelson	Smoot
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Page	Thompson
Curtis	Kellogg	Polindexter	Trammell
Dillingham	Kendrick	Pollock	Underwood
Fletcher	Kenyon	Pomerene	Vardaman
France	King	Reed	Walsh
Gay	La Follette	Saulsbury	Watson
Gerry	McKellar	Shafroth	Weeks
Gronna	McLean	Sheppard	Wolcott
Hale	Martin, Va.	Sherman	
Harding	Martin, Ky.	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] is detained on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Fifty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 356, joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1918, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 4637.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4637) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, on yesterday I was about to present an amendment in the nature of a substitute, of which I gave notice some days ago. I now move to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert as a substitute therefor the amendment which I send to the desk. I ask that it may be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary proceeded to read the proposed substitute and read to the end of section 1.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator from Ohio wish to have the entire amendment read now? Would he rather not have the reading interrupted before it has been concluded?

Mr. POMERENE. I do want to have the entire amendment read, for the information of the Senate. I realize that many Senators have been engaged on very important committee work and I should like to have it in the Record, so that they may know what it is.

Mr. GRONNA. I was going to call attention to a certain provision in the first section, but if the Senator would rather have the amendment read through, I will defer it.

Mr. POMERENE. I would rather have it read through. Then I shall be glad to respond to any question I can.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of Mr. POMERENE's amendment, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and to insert:

That beginning with the 1st day of July next following the passage of this act there shall be deducted and withheld from the monthly salary, pay, or compensation of every officer or employee of the United States to whom this act applies an amount computed to the nearest tenth of a dollar that will be sufficient, with interest thereon at 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually, to purchase from the United States an annuity, payable quarterly throughout life, for every such employee on arrival at the age of retirement, as herein provided. The deductions herein provided for shall, in the case of employees who are in the service of the Government at the time this act goes into effect, not to exceed 8 per cent of the said salary, pay, or compensation; and shall be based on such annuity tables as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct, and interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum, compounded annually, and shall be varied to correspond to any change in the rate of salary, pay, or compensation of the employee: *Provided, however*, That the deductions made from the salary, pay, or compensation of persons hereafter entering the service shall not exceed 8 per cent thereof, and such persons shall be entitled to such annuities only as said deductions with accumulations of interest thereon will purchase.

Sec. 2. That the amounts so deducted and withheld shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and credited, with interest thereon, to an individual account of the officer or employee from whose salary, pay, or compensation the deduction is made, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to invest and reinvest such funds or any portion of such funds in any of the following securities, namely: Bonds of the United States, bonds issued under the provisions of the Federal farm-loan act, bonds or other interest-bearing obligations of any State of the United States, or any county or municipal bonds which may be approved by the board of investments hereinafter provided for.

The moneys deducted from salaries and the income derived therefrom shall be held and invested, as above described, by the Secretary of the Treasury until paid, as is hereafter provided. Any deficiency in the fund hereby created to carry out the provisions of this act shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

For the purpose of aiding the Secretary of the Treasury in investing the funds and enforcing the provisions of this act, a board of investment is hereby created, composed of the Treasurer of the United States, one person to be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury from his department, and one person to be designated by the President from among the employees of the classified civil service. The members of the board of investment shall be sworn and shall hold office until others are appointed and qualified in their stead.

Sec. 3. That all those engaged in the classified civil service shall be retired at 70 years of age and shall be entitled to the annuities and benefits herein defined: *Provided, however*, That if within 30 days before an officer or employee reaches the retirement age, the head of the department or independent office in which he is employed certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury that by reason of his efficiency and willingness to remain in the service the further continuance of such officer or employee would be advantageous to the public service, he may be retained for a further period not exceeding two years, and at the end of two years, by similar certification, he may be continued for another period not exceeding two years. Upon the failure of the head of the department or independent office to make the above-described certificates, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to place such employee upon the retired list.

Sec. 4. That upon absolute separation from the classified civil service prior to the age of 60 years, and only upon such separation, the officer or employee may withdraw his savings then credited to his account, with the accumulations thereon, in one sum. In case of the death of an officer or employee while in the service the amount of his savings and accumulations thereon, shall be paid to his legal representatives.

SEC. 5. That upon separation from the classified civil service at any time within 10 years prior to the age of retirement the officer or employee shall receive such life annuity as his accumulated earnings, including the interest credited thereon, may purchase: *Provided, however,* That if said employee shall die before receiving in annuities a sum equal to his accumulated savings, including the interest credited thereon, together with the compound interest thereon as herein provided, then the balance remaining to his credit over and above the annuities received by him shall be paid to his legal representatives.

SEC. 6. That in case of reinstatement in the classified civil service of any person who at the time of his separation therefrom received a refund under section 4 of this act, he shall be deemed to be a new entrant to the service, and the monthly deductions from his salary shall be computed from his age at the date of such reinstatement unless he shall within 90 days after reinstatement pay to the Treasurer of the United States the amount refunded to him, which shall be applied toward the purchase of the annuity herein provided for and the deductions from his salary thereafter shall be only for such sums as may be necessary to pay for the balance of said annuity.

SEC. 7. That beginning with the 1st day of July next following the passage of this act every officer or employee then or thereafter in the classified civil service who at that time or thereafter shall have reached the retirement age shall be retired, and if in the service of the United States for 20 years or more shall receive from the United States during the remainder of his life an annuity, payable quarterly, equal to one-half of the average annual salary, pay, or compensation received during his entire period of service after July 1, 1912, such annuity not to exceed a maximum of \$600, and to cease at his death. Those who have served less than 20 years shall be entitled to one-twentieth of such annuity for each year of said service: *Provided, however,* That if such officer or employee at his death shall not have received annuities equal to the amount of the savings and deductions from his salary, pay, or compensation, with compound interest, as hereinbefore provided, the United States shall pay to his legal representatives the balance remaining to his credit.

SEC. 8. Upon the retirement of officers and employees as herein provided during any fiscal year, the funds appropriated for their salaries which remain unexpended shall be applied as follows:

First. To the payment of their annuities;

Second. Ten per cent thereof shall be covered back into the Treasury; and

Third. The balance shall be available in the department or independent office from which said employees are retired, for the appointment of other officers or employees in the lower grades. Except as herein provided, all annuities shall be paid out of appropriations specially made for that purpose.

SEC. 9. That every officer and employee in the classified civil service after this act takes effect shall be deemed to consent and agree to the deductions made and provided for herein and shall receipt in full for the salary, pay, or compensation which may be paid monthly or at any other time, and such payment shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all services rendered by such person during the period covered by such payment, except his claim for the benefits to which he may be entitled under the provisions of this act, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 167, 168, and 169 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and of any other law, rule, or regulation affecting the salary, pay, or compensation of any person or persons employed in the classified civil service to whom this act applies.

SEC. 10. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and keep all needful tables, records, and accounts required for carrying out the provisions of this act, including data showing the mortality experience of the officers and employees in the service and the rate of withdrawal from such service, and any other information that may serve as a guide for future valuations and adjustments of the plan for the retirement of officers and employees. The Secretary of the Treasury shall make a detailed comparative report annually to Congress showing all receipts and disbursements, together with the total number of persons receiving annuities and the amounts paid them.

SEC. 11. That this act shall apply only to persons in the competitive classified civil service of the United States, including the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, and the Island possessions, whose salaries, pay, or compensation is paid from moneys of the United States and shall not apply to postmasters or to persons serving in positions excepted from examination, as defined in the civil-service rules. Whenever any person shall become separated from the classified civil service by reason of appointment in the unclassified service, such separation shall operate to take him out of the provisions of this act, except as to payment of any amount that may be due him. The President shall have power, in his discretion, to exclude from the operation of this act any group of employees whose tenure of office is intermittent or of uncertain duration.

SEC. 12. That none of the moneys mentioned by this act shall be assignable either in law or equity, or be subject to execution or levy by attachment, garnishment, or other legal process or to the payment of taxes, local, State, or Federal; nor shall any money paid to any employee or to the legal representatives of a deceased employee be subject to the payment of the debts of such employee.

SEC. 13. That for the clerical and other service and all other expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act during the fiscal year 1917, including salaries and rent in the District of Columbia, there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$20,000 out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. No officer or employee receiving a regular salary or compensation from the Government shall receive any additional salary or compensation for any service rendered in connection with the system of retiring employees provided for by this act.

SEC. 14. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to perform or cause to be performed any or all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect; and his decision as to the amount to be deducted, the amount of interest to be credited, the amount of an annuity or refund to be paid, in any case, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any officer or authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that this amendment, if it is adopted, will destroy the bill that has been reported out by the committee. I think the committee's bill is the measure that should be adopted by the Senate.

I wish to state, further, that the proposed substitute would provide for the possible deduction of 8 per cent of the em-

ployee's salary, which in my judgment would be too unjust and unfair. I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am in favor of legislation that will give some aid to the employees of the Federal Government after they shall be too old to care for themselves. For many years I have advocated the passage of such a law. I must confess, however, Mr. President, that after reading both the bill reported by the Senator from Tennessee and also the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio I am not enthused over either measure. I do not believe that either one of them is scientifically drawn.

I confess, Mr. President, I have not had time to give it the study that a measure of this importance should be given. I know, however, that in the first section of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, which provides for an assessment up to 8 per cent of the salary of an employee receiving perhaps \$900 or \$1,000 a year, it would be a great burden to employees and it would be difficult to pay it. No such power should be given either to a department or to a board, because no employee could afford to pay 8 per cent of his salary when receiving only such a small amount as I have mentioned. If the Government of the United States is to be of any material help to the poor individuals who have been unable during their long service with the Federal Government to accumulate or lay aside any money we ought to be honest with them and enact legislation that will be of some substantial benefit to them.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio is in some respects better than the bill reported by the committee. For instance, in the matter of the investment of the funds I much prefer the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. It is more carefully drawn. It provides how the funds shall be invested. But I can not vote for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio making it possible for a superior officer or for a board which is to have this matter under control to levy an assessment of 8 per cent upon the people who are receiving such small wages.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. The Senator appreciates, of course, that if any annuity is to be paid to these civil employees it must be purchased either by the employee or by the Government or by both the employee and the Government. Three systems, I understand, have been adopted in various countries; that is to say, some countries have adopted the contributory system, where the Government pays it all; in others the employees pay it; and in other countries there is a division of the amount which will be paid for the purchase of the annuity.

I am not sure whether I understand the Senator's position. At this time, not knowing the commitment of the future, with the period of reconstruction before us, with the uncertainties attending the taking over of the railroads, the telegraphs, the telephones, with the uncertainties of the number of employees who will be under the civil service in the future, is the Senator in favor of a proposition that the Government shall now, without further investigation, without having suggested, using the Senator's words, "a scientific system," embark the Government upon a plan by which it shall pay any portion of the amount?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I always have a great deal of respect for the judgment of the able Senator from Utah. I will say to him very frankly that it would perhaps be better to have this matter deferred, but the bill is before us now. These two measures are before us, and while I fully realize that they only provide for a few of the employees who are in the civil service, and we have reason to believe it will be enlarged upon so as to include more, as the Senator from Utah says, I am, however, in favor of a law under which the Government of the United States will pay a certain portion of the annuity. I believe that after an employee has worked for the Federal Government until he becomes 68 or 70 years old and is then unable to perform any work he should not be thrown upon the charity of the cold world, because the Government can well afford to take care of him. I also believe that it would be in the interest of economy to do so. I dislike even to use the words "superannuated clerks," but I know that there are a great many people holding positions now to whom it is a hardship, and also it is a loss to the Federal Government; it is impossible for them to perform their full day's work.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator allow an interruption?

Mr. GRONNA. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator understands that there are 4,000, as shown by the proofs, now in the service of the Government who are absolutely incapacitated for doing any work, and their average rate is about \$1,500 a year, amounting to about a \$6,000,000 tax on the Government now.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I have read the report quite carefully, and I understand there are a great number who are unable to perform a real day's work. Of course I will not admit that all the amount which is being paid to those people would be a saving, because we must select people to take their places, but it is reasonable to suppose that younger men and younger women could be had who would be able to do two times and perhaps three times as much work as those old people are now performing. So in that way there will be a great deal of saving to the Government, and for that reason the Government of the United States can well afford to pay a portion of this cost. We should not only consider it from an economic standpoint, but I think it is the moral duty of the Government of the United States to take care of these people if it is found that they are unable to take care of themselves.

Mr. President, I was about to ask the Senator from Ohio, if he will kindly give me his attention, whether he will be willing to reduce the percentage to be assessed against the employees from 8 per cent to 4 per cent?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I do not think that that could be done under this system. I fear from what the Senator has said that he does not quite understand the plan embraced in the amendment, may I say, in view of a criticism which the Senator made, and I am not finding fault with that at all.

Mr. GRONNA. I understand.

Mr. POMERENE. The general framework of this bill is the same as that contained in the bill which was prepared by the efficiency commission appointed by President Taft. They had worked upon the matter for a year or longer—I can not state exactly the time—and had various extensive hearings, and there is a masterly report upon the subject. Later on the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] was the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and as he stated the other day in the Senate he prepared and the committee reported a bill to the Senate which is in substance the same as that which I have presented. When I became chairman of the committee I took up the matter and the committee with me. We had various hearings and heard a number of the experts who took part in the hearings of the efficiency commission appointed by President Taft. The bill in its present form is the result of the counsel and collaboration of the committee and of these various experts.

If I may say a word further with respect to the amount of the assessment, bear in mind 8 per cent is the maximum only, and that money, whatever is taken, is not taken by the Government for its own purposes, but the 8 per cent or any sum which may be assessed against the salaries is kept in an account by the Treasury with each individual employee, and it is invested at 4 per cent compound interest, compounded annually. These assessments are made in the first place based upon the salaries then paid, so that the amount derivable therefrom at the time the annuitants reach the retirement age will be sufficient to purchase an annuity of \$600 or in no event not to exceed 50 per cent of the salary.

The 8 per cent can only apply to those who are in the advanced stages of life, and it may be said that they only have to pay it for a very much less length of time than do the other employees. The estimate which was given by Dr. Brown, who is now the chief of the Bureau of Efficiency, and I think one of the ablest students of this subject with whom I have come in contact, was that to those who were 20 years of age it would only cost 3 per cent. That is based upon what was believed to be an average salary of \$1,138. I may say that I telephoned for these figures a little while ago, and the memorandum I have has been sent to me in a roundabout way, but I believe it to be practically correct.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, the Senator from Ohio means by that that it would be only 3 per cent the first year. Undoubtedly, it would be more than 3 per cent later on, as the employees grow older.

Mr. POMERENE. No; if the salary remained the same, the assessment would be the same; if the salary was advanced, the assessment would be proportionately advanced; that is to say, assuming now, for the sake of argument, that it would take a 3 per cent assessment on a \$1,200 salary, that would make the annual cost to the annuitant \$36; but if he received a higher salary it would still be \$36; so the per cent would be that much less.

The vice of the other system, as I conceive it, is this: In the bill as reported by the committee, which is known as the McKellar bill, there is made an assessment of 2½ per cent upon the salaries of all employees. I may say that the testimony shows that the cost of this system would not be 5 per cent, as the report indicates, but that it would be within a few tenths of 6

per cent, one-half of which would have to be paid by the Government and one-half, it is said, by the employee. But the difficulty is that that means, under the system that is adopted in the so-called McKellar plan, the maximum annuity which any employee can get being \$600, that he must pay 2½ per cent for that annuity, whether he is old or young, whether he receives a salary of \$1,000 or a salary of \$5,000. So he is paying not only the cost of his own pension, but in part the cost of the pension of his fellow employee. In other words, if a man starts out with a salary of \$1,200 his assessment is 2½ per cent, or \$30 a year; but if, by reason of his attention to business, his talent, his development, he gets a position which pays him \$5,000 a year—it may be in a few years—then he is required to pay 2½ per cent of his \$5,000 salary, or \$125 a year; and that will continue until he reaches the retirement age of 68 years; or, in the language of Dr. Maddrill, who was the expert actuary who appeared before the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, with this limitation of 2½ per cent many of the employees will have to pay twice the cost of their insurance or annuity that they would have to pay if they went to a private insurance company and bought the same annuity.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, if I understand the McKellar bill, it provides that whatever is paid by an annuitant will be set aside to his personal credit.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. Both bills provide for that. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from North Dakota is correct as to that; but bear in mind, please, that when they are figuring the cost of the entire system, they say that to pay one-half the cost of the entire system will require 2½ per cent of all salaries, so that while this money will be actually returned later, yet the Government is having the use of the 2½ per cent; and if the 2½ per cent exceeds the cost of the annuity of a given employee, the other employees get the benefit of that. That is the difficulty of it. In other words—and I say this with all due respect to those who stand sponsors for this bill—when it is said that it is based upon the half-and-half plan, it is a deception, for some employees will be paying on the half-and-half plan, while certain other employees will be paying twice what should be the cost of the annuity.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota allow me to ask the Senator from Ohio a question there?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I was wondering if the Senator from Ohio understood the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota. I may have misunderstood the Senator from Ohio, but I merely intend to ask the question to clear the matter up.

Mr. POMERENE. I shall be very glad, if I have misstated anything, to correct it.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Ohio stated that the Senator from North Dakota was right when he asked whether or not every employee, no matter what he paid, when he got his annuity would get back everything that he had paid. Is that true?

Mr. POMERENE. I am speaking now with reference to the substitute bill. Let me speak of that first.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from North Dakota was asking the question with reference to the other bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Well, there is such a provision. Can the Senator from Tennessee refer to that section?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly. Of course, it is so arranged on the books of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau of the Government that each employee of the Government is entitled at all times to have the entire amount that he pays in refunded to him if he quits the service, with interest at 4 per cent.

Mr. NORRIS. If that be true, then I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio why he says that the employee, under the committee bill, would in some cases have to pay more money than he should; in other words, that he would have to pay for the benefit of some other employee, if he is getting back everything which he has paid in?

Mr. POMERENE. Certainly. Perhaps, to speak more accurately, if the Senator from North Dakota will permit me, I should say that such employee is furnishing more money than is necessary.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. POMERENE. Just allow me to answer the question, if I can.

Note that under the substitute the total cost of this insurance for an employee 20 years of age is 3 per cent. That was the estimate. If you had a system based upon the half-and-half plan, then this employee would only have to contribute to the Government one-half of 3 per cent, or 1½ per cent. That would

be the actual cost of one-half of the annuity which he is to get when he reaches the retirement age. But under the system proposed by the so-called McKellar bill they jump at the conclusion that half of the cost is to be 2½ per cent. Now, as a matter of fact, if the data which were furnished to our committee when I had the honor to preside over it are correct, then this 2½ per cent comes within one-half of 1 per cent of paying the entire cost of the annuity. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. GRONNA. I think I understand the Senator from Ohio. I think there is no substantial difference between the Senator from Ohio and myself. The only difference is that he can explain himself so much better than I can.

Mr. POMERENE. I am sure the Senator from North Dakota has no trouble in making himself understood.

Mr. GRONNA. I think I can make it clear, at least to some, that the employee who receives a higher salary and is assessed 2½ per cent makes a larger investment; but he also receives a larger return; in other words, he receives more interest for a larger annuity. That would be the way I should figure it from a banker's standpoint.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the difficulty is—and I will see if I can not make it a little clearer, perhaps—that if the 2½ per cent on the lower salaries, let us say of \$1,200, amounts to \$30 per year—and that is what it does amount to—under the so-called substitute plan, the cost of that insurance would be 3 per cent, or \$36, while under the McKellar plan the 2½ per cent would amount to \$30.

Now, let us go further. If the employee arrives at a point where he gets a salary of \$5,000 a year, then he must pay 2½ per cent of that salary, or \$125.

Mr. GRONNA. Why should he not pay more? He can afford to do so.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator allow me to be personal?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I will allow the Senator to be personal.

Mr. POMERENE. I know, and I am very glad of it, that my good friend the Senator from North Dakota has been more prosperous in gathering together this world's goods than I have been, but is that any reason why he should get a less salary than I?

Mr. GRONNA. It is no reason why I should get a less salary, but it is a reason why I should pay more taxes. If I have more goods than has the Senator from Ohio, there is no reason in the world why I should not pay more taxes.

Mr. POMERENE. I think that is all true, so far as the public expense is concerned, but when it comes to the purchase of an annuity to make provision for some one else's family or to make provision for his maintenance in his later years—

Mr. GRONNA. Well, now—

Mr. POMERENE. Just one moment—does it appeal to the Senator's sense of fairness that a given employee should help to support another employee's family?

Mr. GRONNA. No; but—

Mr. POMERENE. Pardon me just a moment. In my judgment, if we are going to adopt a system of that kind, then I should prefer that this extra expense should be paid entirely out of the Public Treasury rather than to make one employee pay the expense of another.

Mr. GRONNA. I can agree with the Senator from Ohio, but I ask the Senator this question: Is the amount assessed for the employee credited to his account upon the books of the Government?

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, yes.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Ohio answers "yes." Now, how could the employee paying a larger assessment be said to be discriminated against in favor of the employee who is receiving a smaller salary when every penny is credited to his account?

Mr. POMERENE. For this reason: If each employee was only paying one-half of the cost of his annuity, then it would be perfectly fair to have the system where one employee would be paying \$30 a year and another employee paying \$125 a year, and then out of the sum total of these payments that one one-half of the entire cost of the system is to be paid.

Mr. GRONNA. So that the Senator and I may not misunderstand each other, I understand that we agree upon the proposition that whatever the assessment may be against any employee it is credited to his personal account?

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, yes.

Mr. GRONNA. We agree upon that?

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, yes.

Mr. GRONNA. Is it not also true that the employee who is assessed a larger percentage, or I will say a larger amount, also receives a larger annuity than the one who is assessed a less amount?

Mr. POMERENE. No; the annuity is the same. Please let me state that accurately now, if I can. The highest annuity that any employee can get is \$600.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course that is based upon the time the employee has served.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will yield to me, I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GRONNA. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there any reason why any man in the civil service to-day can not buy an annuity without the amendment of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. POMERENE. Anybody can do it either under the system proposed in the substitute or under the system proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does not take legislation to enable an employee to buy an annuity. The Senator's plan will simply compel each employee in the classified civil service to buy an annuity for his old age to which the Government contributes just a small proportion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. POMERENE. Pardon me just a moment. Let us not confuse the idea. Both plans are compulsory.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that.

Mr. POMERENE. Then, why does the Senator insist upon calling one system a compulsory plan and, by inference at least, saying that the other is not?

Mr. McKELLAR. One is compulsory—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Just one moment, if the Senator will permit me to answer the question. In one case the Government contributes half at the same time that the employee contributes half—and anyone can understand how the employee would be perfectly willing to have a system of that sort—while the other system merely makes it compulsory that he shall buy his own annuity. That is all there is to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Shall buy what?

Mr. McKELLAR. Shall buy his own annuity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. Now, Mr. President, I should like to ask both Senators a question and have the Senator on his feet respond to it. The Senator from Tennessee has just given an outburst to the effect that we are going to compel the employee to buy his own annuity.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is under the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, if the Senator from Mississippi will pardon me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the Pomerene amendment we are going to compel him to buy his own annuity.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want that; I am opposed to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My question is this: Does not the average country blacksmith, the average State school-teacher, the average Methodist or Baptist preacher in the backwoods have to buy his own annuity if he gets it at all? And what particular reason is there to set apart as a favored clan the people who hold office from the Government by their own choice and in nine cases out of ten because they can not earn as much in any other walk of life? And now, Mr. President—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that I am not opposed to that plan. I believe it would be a help to those people to set aside a certain amount, but not a percentage which they could not afford to pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator from Tennessee has indulged in an outburst of eloquence because this particular class is forced to provide for itself. Other classes of men have to provide for themselves, or else in their old age they go naked and hungry.

Mr. President, I am willing to vote for an old-age pension on the model of the British law; I am willing to vote for any sort of a scheme that permits anybody, whether a blacksmith, a Government employee, a preacher, or a teacher to provide for himself or herself by his or her own contributions; but I am not willing to set aside this cohort of men who have special influence with Senators and Representatives as a special and favored bureaucracy, in order that they may be permitted to have, either under the half-and-half plan or any other plan, without material expense to themselves, provision for their old age, when the country blacksmith, the school-teacher, the preacher, and the ordinary one-mule farmer have not got it. After 25 years of this sort of thing you will have a worse bureaucracy than they have in Prussia, and after 25 years of this sort of thing none of you will dare disobey an order that you

get from the Letter Carriers' Association or from any other organization of employees; and very few of you dare do it now.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. POMERENE. I think the floor belongs to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. It does not make any difference, Mr. President, but I think I have the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, the Senator will have to get permission of the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. The floor belongs to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. GRONNA. What is the necessity, may I ask the Senator from Mississippi, of having the Federal Government go into the insurance business if it is going to be a purely economic compulsory insurance system?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I would reply almost in the words of the marine-insurance act that we passed not long ago, if the Senator addresses me upon the economic side of the proposition, that we could do it cheaper and we could do it better and we could do it more satisfactorily to everybody; but I am not arguing that any man has any right at the expense of the other people of the United States to be taken care of in his old age. I am arguing that, if we are going to start a system of having people take care of themselves in their old age by compulsory contributions, it ought not to be confined merely to Government employees.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course all these employees have the privilege and the opportunity now of investing in life insurance without this proposed legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Absolutely; and where they are worth a continental cent they will take care of themselves and they have got enough to do it; they have more than the average school-teacher in Mississippi has. I do not know what the average school-teacher is paid in North Dakota; but the average school-teacher in Mississippi, who is charged with the responsibility of enlightening the next generation, while these employees are charged with nothing in particular, receives from \$40 to \$100 a month during the school term.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I heard the Senator from Mississippi just a few days ago say some very complimentary things about the English Government. Does the Senator know that the English Government established in 1834 and has maintained ever since, not on the half-and-half plan, as is proposed by this bill, but entirely at its own expense, a retirement system for its classified civil-service employees? I do not believe that the prediction of the Senator from Mississippi that the Government of the United States is going to the "demnition bow-wows" will come true if we pass this bill in the light of English history on the subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I never said that it would go to the "demnition bow-wows." I said you would become the mere obedient servants of the civil service.

Mr. McKELLAR. They have not become so in England.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And most of you are already.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is mistaken in talking in that way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure that he is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I remember the history of a distinguished Representative from the State of California who served with me in the other House, and I remember when the letter carriers declared war on him, as the Senator from North Dakota does—for the Senator was then a Member of the other House—they said his name was "Dennis"; that they were going to defeat him; and they found a Democrat mean enough to help do it. Why? Because he wanted to provide for the carriage of the mail at the cheapest rate for the Government that he could, instead of receiving his instructions from the letter carriers.

Now, Mr. President, in connection with the Senator's question, the English Government did, beginning about the time he says—I do not remember the date—

Mr. McKELLAR. It was 1834.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I presume the Senator is right about that. In 1834, or whenever it was, the English Government did inaugurate this sort of a system; but the English Government had the wisdom later on to see that if that sort of a system applied to Government employees it ought to apply to all the people in Great Britain who might reach old age naked and hungry; and

so they passed a universal old-age pension law, which is in existence now. That is what we ought to do.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I shall yield the floor in just a moment or two. I simply wanted to ask a question or two of the Senator from Ohio, and he has very kindly given me the information for which I asked.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I very obtrusively intruded; and I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. GRONNA. I am not complaining at all, and I will presently take my seat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I merely wished to bring to the attention of the Senator from North Dakota, the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Tennessee—all three—that while they were taking care of a particular class they were not paying much attention to protecting from the perils of old age a much more deserving part of the community.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not disagree with the Senator altogether; but I simply want to say, Mr. President, that I can see no earthly use of compulsory legislation requiring that every one of the Government's employees shall take a part of his salary and invest it in insurance; they are permitted to do so now.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from North Dakota has misunderstood the answer given by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] to an inquiry of his. I bring it up because, if I do not properly understand it, I want to be informed. As I remember, the Senator from North Dakota understands that the Senator from Ohio said, affirmed by the Senator from Tennessee, that the employee got back all that he paid in, with 4 per cent interest.

Mr. GRONNA. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is not true, as I understand it.

Mr. McKELLAR. If he disconnects himself from the service before the limitation provided when the pension shall begin, then he gets it all back. Thereafter he gets the pension itself. It is perfectly plain.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is one of the peculiarities of the bill—and I do not know what explanation the Senator from Tennessee has to offer for it—that there would be hundreds of instances in which if the employee could separate himself from the service before he attains the age of 68, he would get a great deal more than if he remained in the service until he was 68 and was retired under the provisions of the bill. Why that is I do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator is mistaken; that is not correct. Those are not the terms of the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I confess that before I asked the Senator from Ohio for the information he has already given I had not had the opportunity of giving this bill the study that I ought to have given to it. I realize that it is a measure of very great importance, but I know enough about financial affairs, Mr. President, and I know enough about how to figure percentages to know that if you are going to assess the employees 8 per cent of their salaries you do not have to ask for legislation here in order to give them an annuity in their old age. For 8 per cent paid to a private insurance company they can be taken care of fully as well as by what you are going to give them under the provisions of this bill. I make that statement without having given it very much study.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator awhile ago asked what reason is there for compelling Government employees to contribute to a fund from which they are to draw pensions if they pay into that fund all they take out. That was, in substance, the Senator's question. I think I can answer it. Understand, I am not by this committing myself to a support of this bill.

The ordinary man who gets a position in this life holds it just as long as his employer wants him to hold the position. The Government employee, under a law which we foolishly passed years ago, has a permanent position given to him, and he can not be gotten rid of except for cause, so that the Government has fastened upon itself a permanent employee. That system has developed this state of affairs, that as these employees become superannuated and incapable of performing their work, while the Government might discharge them upon the ground of incompetency, it nevertheless seems to be a cruel thing to do under those circumstances. Therefore the Government is in that sense compelled to carry these superannuated and sometimes useless employees upon its rolls. Under those circumstances the Government has a perfect right to say to these people who come

here and seek permanent places under this law: "You shall contribute to a fund which will take care of you, so that when you do become superannuated we can let you go, and you will not stand here before us in the attitude of a person we are about to turn out to starve."

That is the reason why the Government has a perfect right to require these employees to pay for a pension. I think the Senator will see that there is a distinction.

Mr. GRONNA. I agree, Mr. President, that there is a distinction; but may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. We will say that there are two persons, one of whom goes into the employ of the Federal Government while the other one stays in the country. He works in the field or on the farm or in the factory. Now, the one who remains at home is not taxed by the community, is he? That person is not taxed by that community, is he?

Mr. REED. The one who remains at home?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. REED. Why, certainly he is taxed.

Mr. GRONNA. How is he taxed if he has nothing to pay taxes on?

Mr. REED. Oh, I can demonstrate to the Senator's satisfaction that there is not a man living who produces more than he absolutely eats up who is not taxed, and even then he pays it as he goes along and as he is eating. I shall try to make that clear, if the Senator will pardon me for a moment.

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly; I shall be glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. REED. Let me assume that I have not a dollar in the world, that I work for \$9 a week, and that I rent a furnished room. When I rent that furnished room the landlord takes into account, first, the investment that he has in that property, or its value; second, the expense of keeping up that property, which includes the taxation. All of those expenses, in the aggregate, are taken out of the tenant; and I, as the \$9-a-week laborer, occupying one of those rooms, pay my proportion of the taxes upon that property. Again, if the shoe manufacturer has to pay taxes—income, corporate taxes, or direct taxes upon his factory—that cost of taxation is carried into the hobbled shoes that I buy at the store. Again, the profits that the wholesaler and the retailer were obliged to charge me included, as a part of their costs, the taxes and burdens that they pay.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, that would apply to both.

Mr. REED. So that this applies now throughout. There is no person in the United States who is a consumer who does not pay taxes. There is no person in the United States who has a house to live in or a room to abide in who does not pay taxes. Therefore, when you propose to pay, out of the fund gathered from all of the taxpayers of this country, an annuity to a particular class of people in this country you are taxing one part of the people of this country for the benefit of that class or portion of the community. There is no escape from the logic of that situation.

If the Senator votes for this bill, or if I vote for it, we must do it with our eyes open to the fact that we are voting to tax the hired man on the farms of our States in order to create a fund to pension ladies and gentlemen in the city of Washington who hold better jobs than he can ever hope to hold in his life.

Mr. GRONNA. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that the laboring man in my State received as high as \$7 a day and board last summer and last fall, so I believe that he can afford to pay a little tax.

Mr. McKELLAR. And if the Senator will excuse me a minute, only a very small portion of the civil-service employees are in Washington. The greater proportion, by far, is outside.

Mr. REED. Well, now, let us see. You never get anywhere by getting a special instance that is outside of the ordinary rule. The Senator knows that the ordinary hired hand in his State before these war conditions arose received on an average of from \$18 to \$25 a month and his board, and at the same time that he was receiving that the salaried employees in the city of Washington were receiving on the average approximately \$100 to \$125 a month, some of them much more, and the day laborers in the city of Washington—I do not mean the unskilled labor, but the ones who work in these departments—were receiving a wage of—I must use my recollection on this—approximately, I think, \$4 to \$5 a day.

So if we pass this bill we do it with our eyes open. Let it be understood that there is no old-age pension provided for the hired men on the farms of our States, the miners in the mines of our States, or, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] said, the school-teachers of our States, the clerks working in stores in our States, the underpaid girls who work in the department stores and other places in our States; that there is

no old-age pension for the factory employee who has labored in the sweatshops under unhealthful conditions; and that it is proposed to tax these people, and from their taxation, wrung from them, to create a fund to take care of people in the city of Washington who hold jobs so desirable that there is a constant struggle to obtain them from every part of the United States.

Now, that is the proposition. That is the cold, unvarnished, naked truth of this matter. The men who vote for this bill vote to tax these people for the benefit of other people who hold jobs so much better than the other people have that they fight to maintain them and insist upon every right that they have under the civil-service law.

The Senator from North Dakota—who usually gets right when he gets to thinking about these things, and generally starts out right, too—might as well face that. It does not answer it to say, "Oh, labor has been getting \$6 or \$7 a day in my State this year." That is abnormal—just as abnormal as the war. It is simply a part of the war.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows that the employees who were working for the Federal Government have been receiving very little more. That is true; is it not?

Mr. REED. The fact is, and it is always true, that salaries—especially the salaries fixed by law, and indeed some other salaries, but especially those fixed by law—do not go up or go down with the rapid fluctuations of values. For instance, there was a time a few years ago when money was at a very great value, when its purchasing power was very great, when wages all over the country were very low, when the salary of a Congressman was most lucrative. Then he was in clover. Then there came the period of high valuations and high wages that we are going through now. The Congressman to-day does not receive as much as many a head clerk does. He does not receive very much more than some people who are only skilled laborers. But when values get readjusted the salaried man gets back to a position of equity; and if he does not, if that does not come in a short time, then comes the cry to raise his wages, a cry that always is heard in the end.

Now, I appeal to the Senator's judgment on this matter. There is no use arguing questions for the simple sake of arguing. You would not need any civil-service law in order to keep people in their positions down here if it were not that the positions are desirable. They are desirable to-day. I have not any doubt that there are 30,000 clerks to-day in the city of Washington, brought in here by these war conditions, over half of whom would be glad to stay here and take these permanent positions. When I use the expression "thirty thousand," that is a guess. There are so many of them that I have no idea what the number is.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GRONNA. I do.

Mr. KING. Apropos of the statement just made by the Senator from Missouri, I have had more than 100 clerks who have come to Washington for war work appeal to me to try to get them under the civil service and keep them here in these Government positions, rather than go home, they are so enamored of the situations.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon an interruption, I wish to say that I have been called upon to-day by quite a number of clerks engaged in the service in Washington who have urged me to bring every possible influence to bear upon the heads of the departments in which they are now engaged to retain them permanently in the service. In the Government service they are receiving larger salaries than they enjoyed as school-teachers, farmers, clerks, and, in some instances, members of the bar. They really desire the work; all of which goes to show the esteem in which the average American citizen holds Government employment.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, it is evident that my simple question has provoked a great deal of discussion. I want to get through. I have not yet said what I intended to say. I simply want to state my own position. I shall only take a minute or two of the Senate's time to say what I want to say upon this whole subject.

I realize that what all of the Senators have said is true. It is undoubtedly true that these employees are receiving, take it one year with the other, larger salaries than they receive in the country or in other employments. But, Mr. President, we must take the conditions as they are. There are different environments here. When I go into these departments and see these very old men and old women—and I know some of them—they have not been able to lay up a dollar for the future. They should have provided for their old age, of course; but that is a theory and not a condition. The actual condition is that we

have here more than 4,000 of these old people, superannuated, too old to perform a day's work, and unable to take care of themselves. What are you going to do? Are you going to throw them out upon the cold world?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, how will this bill help them?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GRONNA. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I wish to ask my friend, the able Senator from North Dakota, if he does not find the same poverty, squalor, and want among the people who have devoted their lives to service in the factories, the houses of merchandise, the fields, and in the workshops—in other words, in all the vocations of life? Does he not find quite as much—really more—poverty, indigence, and suffering among the people of other vocations than he does among the employees here or elsewhere in the Government service?

Mr. GRONNA. No, Mr. President; I will say frankly to my good friend from Mississippi that we do not find it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Do you not find quite as much?

Mr. GRONNA. I come from a State where there are no rich people. We are a new State; nobody is rich, but there is not a single poorhouse in my State—not one.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Then you must be rich, all of you. Your condition is Utopian, and I congratulate you upon it.

Mr. GRONNA. But if they were so poor, our counties, our municipalities, or our State would provide for those institutions.

Mr. VARDAMAN. But you do not want them to do that. You are fortunate that the condition of your people is such that your State is not called upon to provide for the improvident aged poor in institutions of charity. I agree with my good friend, the able Senator, that it is a wise economy; it is an act of great wisdom and of social providence on the part of the Commonwealth—it may be a little bit socialistic in principle—to induce the citizen, even in the form of a tax put upon his property in the days of his prosperity, to lay aside something for a "rainy day," to take care of the old and helpless in the evening of life. That is all right and I most heartily commend the end sought to be attained. I am not opposed to the main principle upon which this proposed legislation is based, but I am unalterably opposed to the principle of partiality. I can not give my consent to any measure that has for its purpose the selection of a certain class of laborers or employees to whom special favors are vouchsafed by law and all other branches of business and vocations are taxed for their especial benefit. I do not think it is fair; it is not just. In fact, I regard it as the most pernicious principle in legislation. It is violative of the very genius of American institutions. No man or class of men would ask for such legislation if they did not feel that they had behind it a coercive influence. So far as I am personally concerned I am going to be just, and when I can be just and at the same time be generous in the performance of the functions of my place it will afford me great pleasure to do so.

Mr. GRONNA. Now, Mr. President, I want to ask my good friend from Mississippi a question.

Mr. VARDAMAN. All right; I will answer it if I can.

Mr. GRONNA. In the State of Mississippi, and in the State which I have the honor in part to represent, our people are not compelled to employ any person when he becomes old and inefficient. Is not that true?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes; it is true.

Mr. GRONNA. Conditions are different here in the city of Washington.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Certainly you are not compelled to employ anybody in your private business. The Government is not compelled to employ any certain individual, nor can any certain individual compel the Government to employ him or her. The Government does not contract or undertake to support an employee until he or she dies. The Government hires a man or woman for the service they are expected to render the Government, and not for the primary purpose of giving the individual employment; and when that person ceases to render acceptable or efficient service to the Government the Government is under no obligations to retain him any more than the Senator is under moral obligations to retain one of his field hands after he has performed the service for which he was first employed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. GRONNA. I will let the chairman of the committee answer that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I be indulged to ask a question of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. VARDAMAN. And I shall be glad to answer the Senator's question, if I can.

Mr. McKELLAR. There are 4,000 old people in the employ of the Government whose employers, under a system that has existed for generations, have permitted them to remain in the Government employ without doing any work, because they are so old they can not do any work, and none is required of them. Do I understand the Senator from Mississippi to say that if he had the power he would turn out these 4,000 old people to graze at this time?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I have great sympathy with the men and women who have spent their lives and reached the evening thereof who have never been able to lay up something for a rainy day. It is a misfortune which confronts many of us both in public and private life, and always to be regretted. I think it is the duty of the State to enact laws protecting each man and woman in the enjoyment of the products of their toil, and, as far as human ingenuity can do so, to see that justice is done to all alike. Now, I would make some provision for the poor, helpless people described by the able Senator from Tennessee; but I would not solve that problem by the adoption of a pernicious measure of the character of the one under consideration. I would rather make a donation outright, or pass a bill pensioning these 4,000 employees, and then notify the balance of the employees of the Government that they must provide for their own support and maintenance, just as people in other walks of life are expected to take care of themselves; or I would provide for the contingency of misfortune, accident, and improvidence which comes to fruition in old age by an old-age pension law, and I would make it apply to all the people of all vocations alike, playing no favorites.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator ever introduced such a bill?

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; I have not; but if I had introduced this bill or had anything to do with its preparation I would have made its benefactions apply equally to all classes of people.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am afraid the Senator from Mississippi does not understand this bill.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator's judgment of me in this instance is the quintessence of charity, for which I am profoundly grateful.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I said at the outset when I rose and made my inquiry of the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and he gave me the information I asked for, that neither of these measures is drawn on a scientific basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GRONNA. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator does not want to be put in exactly that attitude. The bill which has been recommended by the committee is a bill that has been in the hands of the Bureau of Efficiency for about two years, and it is reported out by a Government expert.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not doubt that at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. And that Government expert said that it is a proper bill and effects this purpose.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the name of that expert?

Mr. McKELLAR. Dr. Maddrill.

Mr. REED. What is he a doctor of?

Mr. McKELLAR. He is a doctor of letters.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I find that Mr. Maddrill disapproves of the bill which the Senator from Tennessee has reported from the committee and favors a bill which imposes upon the employee the duty to make the contribution for his own annuity.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, quite the contrary. The Senator has not read what Dr. Maddrill—not at all.

Mr. KING. The Senator is wrong.

Mr. GRONNA. Well, Mr. President, I shall not find any fault with any of the gentlemen who have had this bill under consideration. Perhaps they are right and I am wrong; but I made the statement, and I am going to stick to it, that it is my opinion that neither of the bills is drawn upon a scientific basis. However, I am not going to discuss that now.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. I think the Senator from North Dakota and I both have been very indulgent to one another, and I appreciate very much the Senator's courtesy in yielding; but in

view of the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee, I want to read from the hearings before his committee, on page 26. Let me read what the chairman says about this matter:

The CHAIRMAN. From such examination as I have been able to give to the amended proposition, as suggested by you—

That is, by Dr. Maddrill—

it introduces many complications that it will be very hard for the legislative mind to understand. In other words, it will take an expert explanation, and it is going to be very difficult to get that into the legislative mind under any circumstances.

[Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Ohio that I was perhaps speaking of my own legislative mind, because I am frank to say that the figures that were then given to me were never able to penetrate my mind, and I do not think they can penetrate the mind of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I admit that the virtues of the Senator's bill do not penetrate my mind. [Laughter.] I read further from the statement of the chairman of the committee:

The present bill is absolutely so simple that anybody can understand it. Here the employees are going to contribute half and the Government is going to contribute half, and the pensions provided are fairly equitable. At any rate, all of the employees are willing to contribute on this system that they understand themselves; it has perfectly plain terms; they know exactly what they are going to get. It does not take an expert to explain what they are going to contribute, and it does not take an expert to explain what they are going to get. They can look at the terms of the bill and see what they are going to get and they can look at the terms of the bill and know exactly what they are going to contribute. Why is not that the best system in the world under the particular conditions that confront us?

Now, Dr. Maddrill said, speaking of the bill reported by the Senator from Tennessee:

May I suggest this, that there are several defects in the bill, which I have pointed out, that seem to me to be fatal?

That is the expert that my friend is quoting.

Mr. GRONNA. I thank the Senator from Ohio. It simply shows that my poor judgment is sustained by that expert.

Mr. REED. And that even the legislative mind can appreciate the statement.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am going to vote for this bill, imperfect as I believe it to be, for the reason that I believe it is our moral duty to take care of these more than 4,000 people who seem to be unable to take care of themselves. There is no need in the world to enact legislation which will give an employee an opportunity to invest his money in life insurance. We have life insurance companies that are not run by the Federal Government; and I, for one, must confess that I do not believe we should enact this legislation, increasing the hardships upon these people who have hardly been able to live upon the salary paid them during the last two or three years. The salaries here in Washington may be high. They may be higher than they are in the country. As I said a moment ago, while we have no wealthy people in my State, we have no people there who are dependent upon the public. Poor as they may be, they have a home, humble though it may be. Most of them own a home, and we have not a single poorhouse in the State.

I believe, Mr. President, a measure of the kind I refer to is only fair in a great Government like ours, where so many people are overburdened with wealth. Look at the thousands of millionaires and billionaires. They have become so rich during these few years that they are being oppressed in taking care of their great fortunes. Yet, when it comes to a question of dividing a few thousand dollars among four thousand and a half of worthy old people who have done valiant service for the country, we hesitate to give it to them. Is that a democratic principle, I ask you? We have just gone through this tremendous war, promising not only our own people but the people of the world that we are going to take care of all the people, and here we are refusing to take care of at least four thousand and a half who we know are unable to take care of themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] as a substitute.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	Page	Spencer
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Polindexter	Swanson
Curtis	King	Pollock	Trammell
Fletcher	Kirby	Pomerene	Underwood
France	McKellar	Ransdell	Vardaman
Gay	Martin, Ky.	Saulsbury	Walsh
Gronna	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Warren
Harding	Moses	Sheppard	Weeks
Hardwick	Myers	Sherman	
Henderson	Norris	Smith, Mich.	

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are necessarily absent on official business.

Mr. PITTMAN. I desire to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT] are necessarily detained in the Finance Committee.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] on official business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent owing to illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. FERNALD, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. KNOX, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

Mr. KENYON, Mr. NEW, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. HALE, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE].

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio to amplify his explanation in respect to a number of the provisions in the measure under consideration, particularly that provision wherein it states in substance that one-half of the amount to be paid for the annuity shall be contributed by the employees and one-half by the Government. I understood the Senator to say, and his statement is borne out by the testimony of Dr. Maddrill, that it would cost more than 5 per cent of the employee's compensation or salary to purchase an annuity. It would seem under the testimony of Dr. Maddrill and under the statement of the Senator from Ohio that more than 50 per cent of the cost of the purchase of the annuity was being imposed upon the Government.

I should like to have the Senator explain that, and also explain the provision of his substitute with respect to the 8 per cent of the compensation; that is, the maximum being 8 per cent. I should like to ask the Senator also to state, if he can, from the investigation made and the report of experts, if any have been made, what would be approximately the amount that would be required to be paid by the employees where they make the full contribution for the annuity.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the question of the Senator from Utah is very comprehensive, and it will necessitate perhaps my repeating to some extent what I have already said on the floor of the Senate.

I did make a statement to the effect that under the committee bill it would cost more than 5 per cent, and I based that upon Dr. Maddrill's statement to the effect that 5 per cent would be within a few tenths of 1 per cent less than the actual cost; in other words, that the actual total cost of the bill would be a few tenths of 1 per cent less than 6 per cent.

I did in substance say that many of these employees, if the McKellar bill were adopted, would have to pay more than 50 per cent of their pension. The information which we gleaned when I was a member of the committee was to the effect that when the young man or the young woman was 20 years of age the total cost of his or her pension would be 3 per cent of the average salary, which is \$1,132. If the salary was twice that sum, then the total cost would only be 1½ per cent of the salary. If three times that sum, it would only be one-third of that amount, or 1 per cent of the salary.

I made the further objection to the bill that if we adopted the 2½ per cent assessment a man might be required to pay \$30 per year or \$125 per year, and he would only get the same pension as the one who paid less. In other words, if you analyze the McKellar bill, you will find that instead of calling it a fifty-fifty bill many of the employees would be required to pay not only 50 per cent of the cost of their annuity but in many instances they will have to pay 200 per cent, or twice what their actual pension will cost. I referred to the testimony of the committee's expert, Dr. Maddrill, who sustained that position.

So you have a system here under which the Government is first paying 50 per cent of the cost, and, assuming now that it only costs 5 per cent, you will have the employee paying 50 per cent of the cost of that pension, and even less than that, as I shall point out in a moment, but an amount that is equal to 200

per cent and more of the cost of the pension, depending on the amount of his salary and his age. I say that because under this system if a man is 67 years of age and he has been in the employ of the Government in the unclassified service for 14 years, not intending to be permanently with the Government, and afterwards thinks it is going to be to his pecuniary advantage to get into the classified service, and he gets into the classified service and stays there one year only, and makes certain back payments represented by the 14 years of service which he has rendered in the unclassified service, he is entitled to a pension of \$420 a year. When you call that a fifty-fifty plan it is camouflage.

While the statement has been made here that all those of higher salaries want to do this, I wish to see the credentials authorizing these statements, and they have not been produced by those who make them. It is an easy matter for a man who sits here in Washington representing certain interests and, coming to a certain conclusion, to say, "I represent the employees in 48 States." Senators have had experience in similar committees. Amendments may be offered here on the floor of the Senate to-night at 4 o'clock and through the manipulation of some people who are interested here in Washington send out telegrams and to-morrow morning Senators receive telegrams from people all over their State, and, for that matter, from all over the United States, saying we are in favor of your amendment or we are against it. That kind of telegrams never leads me anywhere, and they are not very persuasive in character.

Now, then, let me go to the other proposition. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GROENNA] speaks of the 8 per cent limitation in the substitute bill. I recognize the fact that if we were taking 8 per cent from all employees it would be an expensive proposition, but they fail to point to the fact that 8 per cent is the maximum that can be taken under all circumstances. This 8 per cent is the extreme amount that may be assessed, and it depends upon the age of the employee and the amount of his salary, and perhaps I ought to explain that preliminarily.

You will understand that the question of health does not enter into the annuity, or, in other words, the insurable character of the employee. The assessment will be based under the substitute plan on two facts which will be all-controlling. The one is the amount of the salary, the other is the age of the annuitant at the time the assessment is made. At the time when the actuary, Dr. Brown, made the estimate the average salary was \$1,132; and assuming \$1,132 to be the average salary, then on that salary, if he enters the service at the age of 20, the total cost of the annuity would be 3 per cent annually. If he enters at the age of 25, it would be 4 per cent annually. If at the age of 30, it would be 5 per cent annually. If at the age of 35, it would be 6.5 per cent annually. At the age of 40 it would be 8 per cent annually. At the age of 45, 11.5 per cent annually. At the age of 50, 16 per cent annually. At the age of 55, 23.5 per cent annually, and at the age of 60, 39 per cent annually. But his annuity, if he were 60 years of age, and was to pay the entire cost of it, would amount to 39 per cent of his salary. Under the plan that we have adopted the Government can only take 8 per cent and the other 31 per cent will be paid by the Government out of the public funds in the Treasury. Now, those figures are based upon a salary of \$1,132. If the salary was twice that, or \$2,264, then you would have to cut these estimates in two.

Mr. President, I wish I could get Senators to give this subject enough attention to understand the total cost of this system. We have the estimate under the substitute bill, which was furnished by Dr. Brown two years ago. I have it before me, and it will be found on page 39 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday. If all those who are 70 years of age are retired, their pension will cost the Government the first year \$2,890,500. From year to year the number of the annuities will increase and the amount of the expense to the Government under this system will increase for a time, then decrease for a number of years, and ultimately be self-sustaining. In 21 years it will reach a maximum, or peak, as the actuary calls it, of \$6,207,600, and then from that peak it runs down to the lowest point in 60 years from date, when it will cost the Government only \$100 for the year. Then the entire system is self-sustaining, but the total cost to the Government during these 60 years until we get to a point where it will be self-sustaining will amount to \$172,351,800. In other words, on the average it will cost the Government about \$3,000,000 a year for 60 years, and then the plan will be self-sustaining.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. KING. Would those figures be continued if the number of the employees of Government within the civil service should increase, as they will, of course?

Mr. POMERENE. Of course, it is very difficult for me to say, because the number of employees retired may increase beyond present estimates, and that would increase the cost. Under all circumstances the assessments are limited to 8 per cent. That is the maximum, understand. So it is possible that the total cost during these years might be more than the figures indicated it, but after that time it will be completely self-sustaining.

Now, let me assume the case of an individual who is getting a salary of \$100 a month. Suppose the Government does take the 8 per cent, it is not taking the money from him. It is saying to him simply this: "You are in the service, and you have been here for a good many years. We want you to set aside \$8 a month, or \$96 a year, and leave it here in a savings bank, so to speak, and we are going to pay you 4 per cent interest per annum, compounded annually upon that amount." In no event is he deprived of a dollar. If, after he becomes 70 years of age and he has paid his 8 per cent, it may be for only one year, he is then retired, and if he lives to be 100 years old the Government is paying him \$600 a year for the remainder of his days. Now, that is the situation. But what about the cost of the other bill? I attribute no fault to the chairman of the committee, but it is just a little remarkable when you take into consideration the fact that they have only attempted to give the cost of their bill for a matter of six years. They only attempt to give you the amount of the assessments for six years, and they estimate that this will show a net surplus in the Treasury over and above the annuities to be paid the first year and will leave a large balance. That is like a good many other half truths. They lead to the worst kind of deception. It will be very interesting to Senators to have a complete statement from their actuaries giving the total cost for each of these years for the full period—60 years. They take no account of the fact that when they claim to retire about 7,500 superannuated employees the Government must replace them with perhaps 3,750 new clerks and they must be paid.

Let me point it out a little more carefully if I can, and I take their own figures for this. I will read from page 7 of the committee's report:

For instance, the estimated receipts from employees during the year 1920 will be \$9,000,000.

But they are only taking, according to their own statement, from the employees one half of the cost of this system. The other half is to be paid by the Government. In other words, by promise of the Government and by contributions from the employees, they expect to get in one year \$18,000,000. Of course, you and I know that the pay roll of the Government is going to increase from year to year by the natural increment of employees, but assuming for the sake of argument that it does not, then you have \$18,000,000 as the cost to the Government and employees together for one year, and for 60 years it amounts to \$1,080,000,000. In other words, the Government will pay one-half of that, or \$540,000,000, in 60 years, whereas the plan in the substitute bill will cost the Government \$172,351,800 for the same term of years. My belief is this: I do not think Government employees are any different from anybody else; and while it may be that some of these gentlemen who are receiving the lower salaries are willing to pay 2½ per cent of their salary for the first part of their term of service, suppose they are advanced from time to time until the salaries become twice their present pay, how long will it be before they come in here with their petitions complaining and saying, "My insurance cost me 2½ per cent when I was only getting a small salary; you are not increasing my annuity, but my salary has been doubled, and you are taking from me twice the amount that you took at first." Wonderfully fair, that is! Yet employees are led to believe that this is a half-and-half plan. They will find out some day that it is not if the McKellar bill is adopted.

Mr. President, just one further thought, and then I am going to conclude. Much is said about employees receiving lower salaries and that they can not afford to pay. I have explained that they are not paying, but simply that they are setting it aside under a compulsory system in a savings bank for a rainy day; that is all. But, on the other hand, let us admit—and I think it is true—that there are many employees who are not getting as much compensation as they ought to have. That, however, is not a reason why we should fit a pension or annuity system to meet their lower salaries. It is a reason why their salaries should be increased. In other words, my thought is that the pay system and the pension system are two separate and distinct things and that we ought either to be for a pension or against a pension, and we ought not to be for or against it

because a man is getting too much or too little pay, for some system of insurance has become a part of the system of the country. Every individual, with rare exceptions, carries a given amount of insurance. He does not carry it because he gets a high salary or a low salary, but he takes out his insurance because he wants some security against a rainy day. That is the situation here. If these salaries are not what they ought to be, then it is incumbent upon the Congress to increase salaries where they are too small and to lower them if any of them are too high.

Mr. President, I have occupied a good deal more time than I expected in this discussion, but I have gone into it so thoroughly in years gone by that I feel intensely the importance of the subject. I do not want the Government to adopt a system now that by later years of experience is going to be so offensive to the public that there will be a demand for its repeal.

I want to say to those employees who are here advocating this system that there are two steps to be taken and to be considered. One is, Shall we establish the retirement principle? The other is, After we shall have established the retirement principle, what shall the plan be? If they are a unit in desiring the retirement scheme, let us adopt a system here that will win to it the support of all. Then, after we have established a retirement system and it develops out of the abundance of experience that we shall have under it that there should be some changes, let us then make them.

If employees were drafted into the service, if they were compelled to remain in the service, then they could come with some grace and make their demands; but there is not one on the pay roll of the Government who was forced to come here. They have come into the departments, they have come into the public service, for the very reason that I am occupying the position I now have, namely, because I was ambitious to get into the Senate; they came into the Government service because they thought in the Government employ there was something of honor attached to it, and that it was a better-paying proposition than 95 per cent of them had before. Let us not forget that fact.

When people come to me and say the people back home are a unit for the system, I deny it. I say that in perfect candor. I know that those words are not welcome; but I am here as a public servant trying to do, as I have the light, that which will not only be rendering service to the employees of the Government but to the people back home as well.

Mr. President, I trust the substitute which I have offered will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the substitute for the bill which has been proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There does not seem to be a quorum present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Shafroth
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Sheppard
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	New	Sherman
Cummins	Kellogg	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Curtis	Kenyon	Page	Spencer
Fernald	King	Phelan	Sutherland
Fletcher	Kirby	Pittman	Swanson
France	Knox	Pointdexter	Thompson
Gay	Lenroot	Pomerene	Trammell
Gronna	McKellar	Pollock	Underwood
Hale	McLean	Ransdell	Vardaman
Harding	Martin, Ky.	Reed	Walsh
Henderson	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Williams

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. Goff] on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Ohio asks for the yeas and nays on his amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee to yield until I can have a resolution reported to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the pending amendment. Let the roll be called, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri with pleasure.

Mr. REED. But there may be further discussion. The fact is that I desire to ask some questions.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield immediately after the roll shall have been called on the pending Pomerene amendment.

Mr. REED. I want to ask a question or two about the amendment before it comes to a vote. The resolution which I desire reported I think will take but a moment for consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the trouble about it is that the yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. REED. That stands.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the roll be called, and then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. What I am trying to explain to the Senator is that the debate may yet go on for an hour.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing to yield to the Senator immediately after the calling of the roll on the Pomerene amendment.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Tennessee does not understand me. The yeas and nays have been ordered, but the roll call has not been started, and the Senator from Tennessee knows there may be further debate, which may last for a week.

Mr. McKELLAR. How long will the consideration of the resolution take which the Senator from Missouri desires reported?

Mr. REED. If the resolution requires any discussion I shall not ask that it be considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. With that understanding, I am perfectly willing to yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Very well.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to report back favorably without amendment Senate resolution 371, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and I call the attention of that Senator to the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, S. Res. 371, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds or any subcommittee thereof be directed to inquire into the costs, construction, operation, maintenance, and future disposition of the public buildings of the Government of every nature, kind, and location and the program and contracts of the various departments of the Government with reference to future costs, construction, operation, maintenance, and disposition of the Government buildings of every nature, kind, and location, and report to the Senate thereon, together with their recommendation of any steps which they may deem advisable to take with a view to remedying conditions.

That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-fifth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not understand precisely what that resolution is. I desire to ask the Senator from Missouri what is the purport of the resolution?

Mr. REED. I can answer the Senator from Mississippi if the Senator from Kansas will permit me.

Mr. THOMPSON. Certainly.

Mr. REED. This is merely a resolution to authorize an investigation as to the expenditure of money for the putting up of public buildings. It grows out of the debate here this morning when there was a request for the information asked for by the resolution. That is all there is to the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The expense to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate?

Mr. REED. The ordinary expenses of the investigation are to be paid just like those of any other investigation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think I have any objection to the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4637) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN's name was called). I am requested to announce the absence of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] on official business. If he were present, he would vote for the so-called Pomerene amendment. I understand he is paired with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. NELSON's name was called). I am requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Minne-

sota [Mr. NELSON] on official business, and also to announce the absence on official business of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. The two Senators are paired upon this question.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "aye."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and vote "yea."

Mr. SHAFROTH (when the name of Mr. THOMAS was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] on account of official business.

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] on official business. Were he present he would vote against the Pomerene amendment.

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] on official business. I understand he is paired with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is detained from the Senate because of attendance on a committee of the Senate.

Mr. KELLOGG (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BAIRD], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. May I inquire whether the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with the Senator from Maryland, which I transfer to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and vote "yea."

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] are detained on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Beckham	Kenyon	Page	Sterling
Cummins	King	Pollock	Sutherland
Dillingham	Knox	Pomerene	Swanson
Fernald	McLean	Reed	Thompson
Fletcher	Martin, Ky.	Sheppard	Underwood
Harding	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Hardwick	New	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—26.

Calder	Hale	McKellar	Shafroth
Chamberlain	Henderson	Moses	Sherman
Curtis	Johnson, Cal.	Myers	Spencer
France	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Trammell
Gay	Kellogg	Pittman	Walsh
Gerry	Kirby	Poindexter	
Gronna	Lenroot	Ransdell	

NOT VOTING—39.

Ashurst	Culbertson	Hollis	McCumber
Baird	Fall	Jones, N. Mex.	McNary
Bankhead	Frelinghuysen	Kendrick	Nelson
Borah	Goff	La Follette	Nugent
Brandeggee	Gore	Lewis	Overman
Colt	Hitchcock	Lodge	Owen

Penrose
Robinson
Saulsbury
Shields

Simmons
Smith, Md.
Smith, S. C.
Smoot

Thomas
Townsend
Vardaman
Wadsworth

Warren
Watson
Wolcott

So Mr. POMERENE's amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to further amendment.

Mr. REED. Do I understand that the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] has been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope this bill will not be forced to a vote to-night. While the question has been debated for a number of days it has been a broken debate, occasioned by many topics and subjects that thrust themselves upon the consideration of the Senate. I wish for my part to deal justly with the employees of the Government, but I do not want to see the employees of the Government singled out for special benefits, those benefits to be paid for by the other citizens of the Republic. There is reason, as I have already suggested, why the Government may rightfully insist that if it gives to employees permanent positions those employees should contribute to a fund which will be sufficient to retire them when they are no longer able to work. Such a law would seem to be a necessary concomitant of permanent Government employment, because otherwise the Government will find itself in the position of having superannuated or disqualified employees upon its hands and be put to the hard condition of either discharging them when they are impoverished and old or of retaining them in their places when they are worthless. But, Mr. President, when it is proposed to take from the taxpayers of the country, who have no pension provided for them, the money with which to pay the pensions of the favored Government employees that is a different proposition.

We have a peculiar condition here in Washington. A bill like the one I have just been discussing ought to have been passed at the same time that we passed the civil-service act, and thereby provided practically for permanent employees for life positions. We did not do it, however, and now we find that there are a large number of old men and old women in Washington who have worked many years for the Government. Many of these people, if discharged, would be without any means of subsistence. So the Government is carrying them upon its rolls, at full pay, although they are incompetent to do the work for which they are paid.

I think this bill ought to go back to the committee. I think the committee ought to report to the Senate a bill providing some means to take care of the present superannuated employees who are without means, and they ought to be retired. Whatever the necessary expense may be we should assume it, because no provision has been made for these people in the past; and while we are under no legal obligation so to do, we are under that kind of moral constraint which comes when the heartstrings are pulling in one direction and cold business in another. That is a very badly mixed metaphor, but I will let it stand. I think the committee ought to report a clean-cut compulsory pension bill, so that in the future we will never find ourselves with a large number of employees upon our hands who are incapable of doing work and who have nothing to live upon.

That sort of bill I will gladly support; but I do not propose, as far as I am concerned, to levy taxes upon the people of the United States who have no pension, who have nobody to look after them, and who, if they have annuities, must pay for them out of their own pocket, for the benefit of Government employees who are all their lives getting better salaries, better pay, better compensation than is generally paid for similar labor. It is not fair to the rest of the people to give a man a life job—and that is substantially what he has under the civil service—and give him a salary which is so attractive that people all over the United States are clamoring for the position he has acquired, and, having given him that benefit, then proceed to tax the rest of the people to take care of him after he quits work. This question ought to be settled on its merits. It ought not to be settled by agitation or by agitators. So far as I am concerned, I have tried to be fair with the Government employee all the time; but I am getting a little tired of a Government employee lobby constantly being around the offices, like Oliver Twist, demanding more and still more.

My heart bleeds for some of these old, decrepit creatures who are barely able to crawl around the departments. It is true that they ought to have saved something from their wages in the past, but I take it most of them have not. Nevertheless, in order to deal generously or kindly with them we ought not to fasten a permanent burden upon the people of the United States.

It is useless to deny that these Government positions are attractive. Because they are attractive, they are sought after on every hand. The wages paid in these positions are fully up to the wages paid outside under normal conditions in similar occupations, and a little better. So you find boys and girls, men and women all over the United States taking civil-service examinations and clamoring for the places, demanding to know why they do not get the places, and insisting that they are not being treated fairly because they have not received them. When they obtain one of the positions it suits them so well that they insist on their right to stay there. They do stay there in preference to entering the ordinary vocations of life.

That is sufficient to show that the position is a little better than the ordinary position they could get. We make that position permanent by virtue of the civil-service law, so that they are not like the general man, liable to be discharged at any moment, and under the disagreeable tension that the job may not exist the first of the next week or the first of the next month. Altogether the position is a desirable one for them. Now it is proposed to pay them a pension, and to pay it by taxing the rest of the people of the United States.

Let us see just how that will work. Who looks after the farmer in his old age? The poor master, unless the farmer has looked after himself. Who looks after the miner in his old age? The poor master, unless he has looked after himself. Who looks after the lawyer in his old age, if he has not saved money, if he has nothing put by? The poor master. Not often, perhaps, does this fall to the lot of the lawyer, and yet it does fall to him. Who looks after the poor girl who works in the department stores? She, again, must shift for her living. She has no permanent job, and if she grows old and superannuated, then God have pity upon her!

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I was interested in what the Senator said in regard to the lawyers. It may refresh the Senator's recollection when I state that the average earnings of the lawyers of the United States before the war, as shown by recent statistics, were approximately between \$750 and \$800 per year. The average earnings of school-teachers were considerably less; and the average earnings of the American people, wage earners, were somewhere between \$500 and \$600. So that the employees of the Government here in Washington and elsewhere under the civil service are getting very much more than the working people throughout the United States, and many of the professional classes, too.

Mr. REED. Under normal conditions.

Mr. KING. I mean, of course, under normal conditions.

Mr. REED. We might as well look at this question fairly. It is not to be settled, or ought not to be settled, by a resolution passed in some labor council. I have the utmost respect for those organizations, but I asked a member of one of them the other day if he thought it was right to tax the union carpenter who was working in Kansas City to pay an annuity to a civil-service gentleman who was working down here in the gun factory, when nobody took care of the carpenter out there. My friend could not answer the question. I ask the same question now. But, returning to my theme, take the school-teacher.

The school-teachers of the United States are paid on the average from one-half to one-third what is paid here to Government clerks. Who takes care of the school-teachers in their old age? Who pays them annuities? The Senator from Mississippi said that if we were going to provide an old-age pension or a disqualification pension for the employees of the United States Government, we ought to do it for all of the people of the United States at the same time and not single out the favorites of the Government. Is that not a just proposition?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Mississippi cited as his authority the English Government, which I have previously cited, and said that they started with pensioning the civil employees in 1834, and added these two afterwards. If the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Mississippi believe in the theory of old-age pensions, which I am frank to say I have not examined, is it possible that these distinguished Senators believe that it can be done all at one fell swoop; or would it be wise to follow the example of the English Government, which has had experience in it?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there are three or four answers to that proposition. The first one is that it does not make a particle of difference to me what the English Government has done or what it has not done. It may have acted wisely, and it

may have acted unwisely. The English Government used to sell, and for many years did sell, its commissions in the army. That would have afforded no reason for us to have ever done it in this country. The English Government has a titled aristocracy that constitutes the English House of Lords. That is no reason why we should have it here. The English Government has a King. That is no reason why we should have one here. The English Government has classes among its people. That is no reason why we should have them here. England has sovereigns and citizens; we have sovereign citizens.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. REED. The English Government has a good many things that I would not have here if I had to start a rebellion to prevent it.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be all true; but every other government on earth except the United States Government and the Government of Turkey and perhaps the Government of Venezuela, in South America, has established a system of retirement for its civil-service employees. Is it possible that all other governments on earth are wrong and that only the Government of the United States and the Government of Turkey are right?

Mr. REED. Now, the Senator has emigrated from England and spread himself out over all the world. That is too big a territory for me to discuss; but I want to say to the Senator that it is not true that every government on earth has a civil-service system in its government.

Mr. McKELLAR. There may be some forms of government down in the South African countries that I do not know anything about.

Mr. REED. No; more than that. But I do not intend to follow this in detail. How much good does it do to know that some other Government has done something to a certain class of employees unless you know about the employees? Suppose that the German Government provided for its soldiers a pension of a certain amount, and you cited that as an example—would it help us out any? An American soldier gets a dollar a day. I understand that a German soldier gets about 4 cents a day. A man who gets 4 cents a day has to have a pension when he can not work any more or he would starve to death. The other man might or might not need a pension. Conditions of life make these differences. What about the salaries in these countries? Are they paid \$100 a month? Are they paid \$150 a month? Do they have the opportunity of promotion up to \$3,000 or \$4,000? Are they paid \$6, \$7, and \$8 a day as wage earners? Is that the condition you find in England?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the question is addressed to me, I shall take a great deal of pleasure in answering it. The pensions granted to the civil-service employees are in proportion to the salaries paid by the Government.

Mr. REED. That is not the question I am raising.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is precisely the same question.

Mr. REED. No; it is not. The Senator does not understand my proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think I do.

Mr. REED. Suppose in the United States we pay a clerk \$2,000 a year. Suppose, merely for illustration, the same kind of a clerk in England gets but \$300 a year. Manifestly there is more equity in pensioning the poor creature who has been starved all his life over there than there is pensioning the one who gets \$2,000 a year here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, there might be.

Mr. REED. There might be? I should say there would be.

Mr. McKELLAR. There might be a case singled out in that way; but taking the general rule, the pensions accord with the salaries paid, just as we propose in this bill to make the pensions accord with the salaries paid.

Mr. REED. That is absolutely unjust. It proceeds upon the idea that if the Government has paid to one man good wages all his life it also will pay him a big pension after he quits work. But if the Government has paid another small wages all his life, it will dole out to him a meager pension after he can no longer work. Thus you give the man who never had a chance to lay by anything for a rainy day the little pension, while you give to the man who has had a chance to amass a competence a larger pension.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator manifestly has not read this bill. If he had read this bill he would know that that is not what this bill provides.

Mr. REED. That is just what the Senator said.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; not at all. The bill provides that they shall be divided into four classes, and paid \$600 in

one class, \$540 in another class, \$480 in the next class, and \$420 in the last class.

Mr. REED. Exactly. Well, I just took the Senator's own statement; that was all. I took the statement the Senator had just made, and I commented on it. I think his statement just made confirms me.

Now, Mr. President, I want to return to my theme. Who is going to pay the old man in the Senator's own State who has worked hard all his life at common labor? Who is taking care of him? Who is pensioning him?

Mr. McKELLAR. If he was a Federal soldier the Federal Government is pensioning him, and if he was a Confederate soldier the State of Tennessee is pensioning him. We are trying to protect them and care for them, just as we are trying to do in this bill.

Mr. REED. Suppose he was a soldier in neither army, but just a plain, ordinary citizen. The soldier, of course, stands in a class by himself. He has been pensioned because of his heroic sacrifice of the richest and best years of his life.

Mr. McKELLAR. Sometimes he has and sometimes he has not. Sometimes he has been put on the roll by Congress when he has never been in the Army.

Mr. REED. Oh, well, the Senator is merely dodging the question.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I am not.

Mr. REED. The Senator is trying to take an exception to a general rule and is arguing from that. The Senator can not put up the soldier pension roll as an argument. The soldiers have been pensioned for different reasons than the one that is being assigned here. They will be pensioned, some of these boys that come back from France, not because of the reasons assigned for this bill, not upon that basis, but upon the basis that they imperiled their lives and their health in defense of their country while others escaped that ordeal.

Let me tell you why foreign countries do not furnish a very good example on the question of old-age pensions. The old-age pension proposition in European countries grows out of conditions that are a disgrace to those countries. Men are born substantially to one place in life. They have little opportunity given to them. They are often compelled to work for a wage that does not permit the gathering of a competence. Although they have pinched and starved throughout their entire lives, when the shadows of old age engulf them, when they are groping and staggering toward the tomb and no longer able to support themselves, they become public charges. It is because of those conditions which obtain in Europe that they have the old-age pensions.

In this country we have had a different theory. We have contended that a man ought to be taught to take care of himself, that he ought to have a chance to make a living, a chance to save something, to take care of himself in old age, so that he would not be a public charge, so that he would not be a pauper, so that he would not require the crutch of government to hobble through the world upon. That has been our theory of government—a theory upon which we have prospered beyond every other nation on earth—a theory that has developed a manhood in this country that I unhesitatingly pronounce superior to the manhood of any other country under the sun.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. REED. I will yield for a question, of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. What does the Senator do in his own State with the helpless and superannuated? Does not the State take care of them in the State of Missouri?

Mr. REED. Oh, no, Mr. President; not in the sense that the Senator employs.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was honest in that. They do in my State.

Mr. REED. The Senator is discussing something that I did not say. I was asking the Senator who provided a pension for these people in the respective States, trying to make it plain to the Senator that while this bill proposes to single out the Government employee and take care of him nobody proposes to pension the faithful servants and laborers of the States, but, on the other hand, it is intended to tax them for the benefit of the Government employees.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to make a suggestion to the Senator. In his own State the government of the State of Missouri singles out the old people in that State, and not only pensions them in the truest sense of the word, but it furnishes houses for them, it furnishes help for them, it furnishes clothes for them. After all, it is just a question of the method, whether you furnish poorhouses for them or whether you furnish pensions for them. The principle is precisely the same.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There are poorhouses and palaces; that is the difference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite the contrary.

Mr. REED. The Senator is talking about my State and making an assertion about it that does not exist at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Have you no poorhouses in the State of Missouri?

Mr. REED. Yes; we have a few; but the Senator has been talking about the State of Missouri pensioning the old people of Missouri. The Senator insists on arguing everything but the case at issue. The alternative for pensions is not poorhouses.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the practical alternative.

Mr. REED. If that be true, then your bill ought to provide for pensions for all the old people of the United States, and not leave the poorhouses to take care of everybody except the favored Government employees. Why should you send the unfortunates of Tennessee to the poorhouses of Tennessee and pension the employees in Washington, who have been paid more money all the years they have worked here than similar employments pay in your own State?

Why have you got poorhouses in Tennessee, if you want to make that kind of a comparison? You have them because it is better to keep unfortunates in poorhouses than to let them starve. But that is not the question we are discussing. We are not discussing the question whether people, when they are impoverished and in want, shall be allowed to starve. We are discussing the question whether a few people out of all the people of the United States shall be singled out, and, first, be given a better salary than is paid in similar private employments; second, be given jobs for life; third, be given pensions. We are asking whether these pensions should be paid for by taxes wrung from people who have neither a Government job nor a Government pension. We are inquiring whether the Government employee should have a pension even though he possess a competence and the citizen who never had a Government job should in old age, if helpless and poor, be given a ticket to the poorhouse? That is what we are discussing. You may wiggle and twist, and twist and wiggle, and squirm from now until eternity shall dawn, and you have got to come back to that proposition. You can not get away from it.

Let us see. Somebody said here this afternoon the poor people, the laborers in the States, did not have to pay any taxes. I answered that then, but I want to answer it now in connection with what I am saying. There was never a bigger fallacy in the world than that. The man who sleeps in a rented furnished room when he pays his rent pays the taxes upon that room. The man who wears a pair of hobnailed shoes when he buys them pays a part of the taxes of the retail dealer, of the jobber, of the manufacturer, of the tanner who tanned the skin, and of the farmer who raised the cattle. In the last analysis everybody in the world who is not a pauper is a taxpayer. The burden rests upon all. So when it is proposed to pension the \$150 a month clerk in Washington and pay that pension out of taxes, let it be understood that the \$50 a month country school-teacher in Tennessee pays her part of the pension and has no pension provided her. The \$50 a month clerk—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. One moment. The \$50 a month clerk in the bank in Tennessee or North Dakota pays a part of that pension and has none provided for himself.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. In just a moment. Let it be understood that the \$2 a day laboring man working on the section pays a part of that pension and nobody provides a pension for him. The farmer in his field in Tennessee or North Dakota or Missouri pays a part of that pension, but if anybody furnishes an annuity for him it is after he has paid for it in coin of the realm taken from his own pocket. The blacksmith, the groceryman, the carpenter, all classes of men in all the States you must acknowledge will be taxed for the purpose of paying the pension of the clerk in Washington. But there is no pension provided for these ordinary citizens. In their old age and poverty you propose to send them to the poor farm. Mr. President, gentlemen may seek to justify that, but it is favoritism, pure and simple.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I would not disturb the Senator, but in discussing the question he does me an injustice in the few remarks which I made. It was said by some Senators that these clerks paid no taxes. I think I made the statement that neither does the laboring man on the farm pay taxes. I know as well as the Senator from Missouri, at least I know to a certain extent, that every man pays a consumption tax.

Mr. REED. The clerk pays just the same as these other people.

Mr. GRONNA. But the Senator will admit, I am sure, that these clerks do not buy hobnailed shoes, they buy some other kind of shoes, and they pay proportionately the same tax that the people on the farm pay.

Mr. REED. Let me answer that. It is true the clerk in Washington who consumes, who has rent to pay, pays taxes just the same as these other people similarly situated pay taxes, and those taxes go into the Government Treasury. Now, all having contributed to a common fund, you propose to have one class take out of the common fund certain benefits you deny to all others. One class is to get back a part of that tax and the other class is not.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will permit another interruption—

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the Senator and I quite agree, or we are not very far apart. I stated at the outset, in the few remarks I made, that my sympathy is for the 4,500 superannuated clerks who are not performing efficient service, who have no way of taking care of themselves. We ought to make some provision for them. I think the Senator from Missouri agrees that that ought to be done.

Mr. REED. I am willing to do that as an act of grace.

Mr. GRONNA. I made the further statement that I believe both these measures were unscientifically drawn.

Mr. REED. I agree with that.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the Senator from Ohio, whose amendment I opposed, read from the hearings or from some document where some expert supported that statement. I am perfectly willing, and I take it from the course on which the Senator from Missouri has set out, knowing him as well as I do, that he is willing to support some legislation that will help out the 4,500 people who are here at the expense of the Government, unable to perform efficient service. However, they are here, and we ought to take care of them. Is it not true that we ought to have some legislation for their relief?

Mr. REED. Exactly so. I say that this bill ought to go back to the committee, and a bill should be brought in with a provision to take care of these superannuated clerks, carefully guarded of course, so that we will not find ourselves taking care of people who do not need help, and then there ought to be, if you desire—

Mr. McKELLAR. And let the Government bear it all?

Mr. REED. Yes; that part of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is very much more than we propose.

Mr. REED. Oh, no. Then let the other people be provided for out of funds to be paid by the employees themselves.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. REED. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no man in the Senate for whom I have greater admiration, especially for his ability as a debater and a reasoner, than the Senator from Missouri, and I wish to ask him this question: When he labors so carefully and in such detail as to the laboring man, as to the school-teacher, as to the man on the farm, the man in the shop, who has the great burden of taxation, does not the Senator think he is just a little unfair in his argument, because he has not mentioned that other great body of people who pay the real income of this Government and from whose taxes this annuity is to be most largely obtained? I have not heard the Senator say anything about those who pay the income taxes of the country, the wealth of the great corporations of the country, that pays almost seven-eighths of the taxes of the country.

Mr. REED. If the Senator had followed my line of reasoning a little more carefully, he would have found that I had absolutely included them.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not so understand. I thought the Senator was laying very little stress on the capitalistic classes.

Mr. REED. I am going to make it so plain that the Senator will understand. I said that the man who rented a room, who did not have a dollar on earth except his daily wage, paid the taxes upon that building proportionately; that the man who wears shoes paid the taxes proportionately with the retail dealer, the wholesale dealer, and the manufacturer. I in effect said that in the end the burdens of government, no matter how you may seek to avoid or obscure it, must at last fall upon the great producing classes. It is true that when men have gathered enormous profits the tax upon those profits is primarily collected from them, so that apparently the taxes are largely collected from the capitalistic classes, but the capitalistic classes, if we may use the term "classes," and I do not say it offensively,

transfer that tax right down the line, as I have shown, to the ultimate consumer. This they do without the least "variation or shadow of turning." It is practically the universal rule. So while I did not name capitalists specifically, they were nevertheless covered in my illustration.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 6, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 5, 1918.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Carter Glass, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Charles E. Bunnell, of Fairbanks, Alaska, to be United States district judge, District of Alaska, division No. 4. A reappointment, his term expiring January 5, 1919.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Rinehart F. Roth, of Fairbanks, Alaska, to be United States attorney, District of Alaska, division No. 4. A reappointment, his term having expired.

Julian P. Alexander, of Jackson, Miss., to be United States attorney, southern district of Mississippi, vice Joseph W. George, resigned, effective December 31, 1918.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 5, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Representative TEMPLE offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, we thank Thee for Thy goodness which Thou hast revealed to us. We recognize Thee as the King of Kings, the Governor among the nations, and we pray that Thy blessings may be upon this Nation. Guide the deliberations of those who attempt wise laws. Hold us and keep us in Thy way. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SANATORIUM FOR DISCHARGED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12917.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12917, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not, and the Doorkeeper will close the doors and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it takes a call of the House.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will say aye—

Mr. MANN. But the point of no quorum was made before that motion was put and the Chair decided there was no quorum present and the Chair can not now put the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The Chair had decided there was no quorum present. The Chair can not now put a motion before the House except a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to respond to their names:

Anderson	Blanton	Caldwell	Carter, Mass.
Anthony	Bowers	Campbell, Kans.	Carter, Okla.
Bland, Ind.	Brumbaugh	Carlin	Church